

ATTENTION: All of the redacted text in the emails that follow is protected by FOIA Exemption 5: Inter-agency or intra-agency communications that are protected by legal privileges.

2016-005625-R5--1

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

01/05/2010 04:39 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc David Pfeifer, Eric Brossman, Peter Jackson

bcc

Subject Re: Ohio DU consultation communications....

Agreed. I talked with Dave about the exact same thing before I left today. We need to have calls with both FWS and OH.

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

Candice Bauer

----- Original Message -----

From: Candice Bauer

Sent: 01/05/2010 04:13 PM CST

To: Linda Holst

Cc: David Pfeifer; Eric Brossman; Peter Jackson

Subject: Ohio DU consultation communications....

Linda,

I propose that we (you, Dave, me, others) have a call with FWS before we send out the Eric's Ohio approval letter/BE to let them know what we are doing and to prime them to get the letter. Also in the letter to FWS with the BE for Eric's package (and on the call), we should indicate that we would like to further discuss future DU consultations (i.e., regional consultation on ammonia, DO, temp, pH, cyanide, and chlorine criteria) to resolve the outstanding nonconcurrence (Petes DU BE). I am planning to come up with a plan at some point in the near future of what information/analysis we need to do so we can start getting it done and put together a target date for our BE completion to initiate formal consultation. We may not have the plan done when we call them for Eric's stuff, but we will let them know that they can be as involved as they want in the initial scoping/planning to make sure they get what they need for us to enter formal consultation.

I think we should also have a call with OEPA prior to sending the approval to give them the heads up about this and the coming formal consultation route we are heading down.

Candice

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.

Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)

77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604

Office Phone: 312-353-2106

Fax: 312-697-2668

I am working on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday of each week and will return any messages on my next work day.

2016-005625-R5--2

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Linda Holst

02/04/2010 01:53 PM

cc pfeifer.david, jackson.peter, brossman.eric, blair.kimberley
bcc

Subject Re: Urgent: Talking Points for OH calls

Here is the answer to Linda's question that I put together this morning....

Per our phone calls today, we have told OEPA and OFWS that we are preparing to enter formal consultation on ammonia, DO, temperature (maybe pH, cyanide, chlorine) to resolve the outstanding designated use consultations... So, we can get the final letters out on that.

Next steps:

- (1) I will get with Nicole and try to get her feedback on the scope of formal consultation, which segments, and nail down criteria that she thinks must be included.
- (2) Then, I will make sure that Kim and Pete and I are working toward the goal of getting our stuff together and off to HQ ASAP (mid March is my target).
- (3) I am going to give Caroline the heads-up on this as well.
- (4) I have sent an initial inquiry to Lisa Huff re: ammonia criteria and the ICE model and asked her who would be good to hook in at HQ from a staff level, so I will follow-up on that as well.



Talking Points for FWS and Ohio EPA Call on Designation Use Changes 020410.doc

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668

I am working on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday of each week
and will return any messages on my next work day.

Linda Holst

I need to say something to OEPA about...

02/03/2010 03:44:58 PM

From: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US
To: Eric Brossman/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/03/2010 03:44 PM
Subject: Urgent: Talking Points for OH calls

I need to say something to OEPA about what formal consultation means. I took a stab below. Can you review/modify?

- R5 is going to consult with USFWS on criteria for [insert pollutants] to ensure that they are protective of [insert which species]
- That consultation will likely result in more stringent criteria which we will be looking to OEPA to adopt

For the FWS calls, I would like to give them an idea of what our timeframe is. When are we going to have something for them to look at which describes what we think the criteria need to be to be protective?

2016-005625-R5--3

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

03/09/2010 09:54 AM

To Grace Robiou

cc Amy Newman, Evelyn Washington, Janita Aguirre, Joe Beaman, Lee Harrigan, Shari Barash, Sharon Frey

bcc

Subject Re: WQSMA March 18 Meeting: Call for Agenda Items

It makes more sense to have a face-to-face discussion on the downstream use issue when OGC is available. Thanks for the suggestion.

Grace Robiou

Several suggestions: 1. OST is in rec...

03/09/2010 09:45:48 AM

From: Grace Robiou/DC/USEPA/US
To: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Shari Barash/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Amy Newman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Evelyn Washington/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Joe Beaman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Janita Aguirre/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Sharon Frey/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 03/09/2010 09:45 AM
Subject: Re: WQSMA March 18 Meeting: Call for Agenda Items

Several suggestions:

1. OST is in receipt of the cyanide BO from the Services. Perhaps Joe Beaman is available to provide a summary of plans and next steps? (Joe)
2. Interim changes in SHPD management until permanent backfill is identified for Denise Keehner. (Evelyn or Grace)

The item from the Feb call that was to be continued in March was downstream waters protection. While I still think we need to discuss this item, I would need help from Linda Holst in presenting it. Linda, do you want to tee this up at the March call or leave this to the face-to-face meeting for a full discussion, to include OGC. I am not sure we can get Lee on the phone next Thursday.

Lee Harrigan

Hi Everyone, Please let me know as so...

03/08/2010 05:49:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--4

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US
03/31/2010 05:49 PM

To "Wade Lehmann"
cc
bcc

Subject Fw: WQSMA April Meeting: You are a proposed presenter!

Hi, Wade. It looks like we may be co-leading a session on ESA. I was going to ask Lee if we could have at least 30 min from the criteria session. Are you in next week so we could touch base on how the session should go?

Thanks.

Linda
(312) 886-6758
Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services
Grace Robiou

----- Original Message -----

From: Grace Robiou
Sent: 03/31/2010 05:04 PM EDT
To: Linda Holst
Cc: lehmann.wade@epa.gov
Subject: Re: WQSMA April Meeting: You are a proposed presenter!

I think Joe had appointed Wade to present on his behalf.
Linda Holst

----- Original Message -----

From: Linda Holst
Sent: 03/31/2010 12:02 PM CDT
To: Lee Harrigan
Cc: Amy Newman; Evelyn Washington; Grace Robiou; Hazel Groman; Joe Beaman
Subject: Re: WQSMA April Meeting: You are a proposed presenter!

Yikes. I'm ok with co-leading two sessions. Do we have replacements for Joe because I need to talk with those folks about their ideas for the session.

For the Criteria session, can we have a bullet for "Regional efforts on criteria development and ways to improve coordination"

For the ESA session, can we add a bullet for "Formal Regional Consultations - tips on approaches that have worked or don't work and for ensuring some level of consistency"

Strategy for Criteria Development:

Approach for Reviewing/Revising Existing Criteria

Joe Beaman and Linda Holst

Discussion to include:

- Optimizing the current system of working with ORD
- Strategies and outlook for updating old criteria and developing new criteria
- Current barriers and ways to eliminate or minimize them

LUNCH (ON YOUR OWN)

Endangered Species Act Consultations:

Next Steps and Managing the 7(d) Backlog

Joe Beaman and Linda Holst

Session will include a discussion of EPA's next steps now that we have received the cyanide BO from the Services

Lee Harrigan

Hi Everyone, I met with Amy, Grace, H...

03/22/2010 04:25:36 PM

From: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US
To: Amy Newman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Grace Robiou/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lee Schroer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Shari Barash/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, John Delashmit/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Dana Thomas/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jim Keating/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Joe Beaman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Evelyn Washington/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Hazel Groman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 03/22/2010 04:25 PM
Subject: WQSMA April Meeting: You are a proposed presenter!

Hi Everyone,

I met with Amy, Grace, Hazel, and Shari today to hammer out a proposed agenda for next month's face-to-face meeting.

You have been identified as an expert who can help us address one or more of the topics that have been requested/identified for the meeting.

Please take a look at the attached draft agenda and let me know ASAP if you have any questions or concerns.

Once we have these sessions confirmed, I will be asking for regional and state co-leads. Please let me know if you have any recommendations

Thanks!

Lee

566-1666

[attachment "WQSMA Agenda Draft 3-22-10.docx" deleted by Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US]

2016-005625-R5--5

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
04/06/2010 09:39 AM

To Linda Holst
cc
bcc
Subject first draft ESA paragraph for WQSMA mtg

Here is my first round on the descriptor paragraph for the ESA section. Feel free to add to/edit/or rewrite it as you see fit.

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, and potential paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations. We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level.

ATTENTION: All of the redacted text in the emails that follow is protected by Exemption 5. Inter-agency or intra-agency communications that are protected by legal privileges.

2016-005625-R5--6

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

To Wade Lehmann

04/06/2010 12:50 PM

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: ESA issues for Branch Chiefs meeting

Here's the input I got from Candice. I think some of this you are already covering.

----- Forwarded by Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US on 04/06/2010 12:37 PM -----

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: pfeifer.david@epa.gov, poleck.thomas@epa.gov
Date: 04/06/2010 09:54 AM
Subject: ESA issues for Branch Chiefs meeting

National Consultation

[REDACTED]

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology because of the different data and methods, ie., they are not traditional tox tests).

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
I am working on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday of each week
and will return any messages on my next work day.

2016-005625-R5--7

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

04/06/2010 01:01 PM

To Lee Harrigan

cc Charles Delos, Clair.Meehan, Luis Cruz, Wade Lehmann,
wgal.jennifer

bcc

Subject Re: WQSMA Thursday Sessions on ESA and Criteria
Development

I think the revision is fine.

Lee Harrigan

Hi Everyone, One of our state member...

04/06/2010 12:09:30 PM

From: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US
To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Luis Cruz/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Charles
Delos/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com, wgal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us
Date: 04/06/2010 12:09 PM
Subject: WQSMA Thursday Sessions on ESA and Criteria Development

Hi Everyone,

One of our state members, Jennifer Wigal, is available to help plan the ESA session. However, she has to head home in the afternoon, mid-way through the session as it is currently scheduled.

I understand that the ESA session needs 90 minutes and that the criteria session may only need 3 hours. Here's how it would look with this change.

DAY THREE - Thursday, April 22		WITH 1/2 HOUR SWAP
8:30-11:30	Strategy for Criteria Development: Approach for Reviewing/Revising Existing Criteria <i>Linda Holst, Luis Cruz and Charlie Delos</i> Discussion to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Optimizing the current system of working with ORD• Strategies and outlook for updating old criteria and developing new criteria• Current barriers and ways to eliminate or minimize them• Regional efforts on criteria development and ways to improve coordination	
11:30-1:00	LUNCH (ON YOUR OWN)	
1:00-2:30	Endangered Species Act Consultations: Next Steps and Managing the 7(d) Backlog <i>Linda Holst and Wade Lehman</i> Session will include a discussion of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• EPA's next steps now that we have received the cyanide BO from the Services• Formal Regional Consultations - tips on approaches that have worked or don't work and for ensuring some level of consistency	
2:30-3:00	Wrap Up & Adjourn	

HOWEVER, Since you are already discussing tweaking the times, I wanted to ask whether it would be possible to hold the ESA session in the morning and the criteria session after lunch? Here's how it could look with the change in time allotment and a switch in order.

DAY THREE - Thursday, April 22		OPTION B
8:30–10:00	Endangered Species Act Consultations: Next Steps and Managing the 7(d) Backlog <i>Linda Holst and Wade Lehman</i> Session will include a discussion of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA’s next steps now that we have received the cyanide BO from the Services • Formal Regional Consultations - tips on approaches that have worked or don't work and for ensuring some level of consistency 	
10:00–10:15	Break	
10:15–12:00	Strategy for Criteria Development: Approach for Reviewing/Revising Existing Criteria <i>Linda Holst, Luis Cruz and Charlie Delos</i> Discussion to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optimizing the current system of working with ORD • Strategies and outlook for updating old criteria and developing new criteria 	
12:00–1:30	LUNCH (ON YOUR OWN)	
1:30–2:30	Strategy for Criteria Development Continued: Approach for Reviewing/Revising Existing Criteria <i>Linda Holst, Luis Cruz and Charlie Delos</i> Discussion to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current barriers and ways to eliminate or minimize them • Regional efforts on criteria development and ways to improve coordination 	
2:30–3:00	Wrap Up & Adjourn	

Please let me know what you think!
 Thanks,
 Lee
 566-1666

2016-005625-R5--8

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
04/06/2010 01:33 PM

To Lee Harrigan
cc Charles Delos, Clair.Meehan, Linda Holst, Luis Cruz,
wgal.jennifer
bcc
Subject Re: WQSMA Thursday Sessions on ESA and Criteria
Development

I don't see a problem shifting ESA to the morning session personally . That also allows a little more flexibility with the criteria section following if they don 't believe they need all 3 hours.

Wade

Wade Lehmann, PhD
Ecological Risk Assessment Branch
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science & Technology, Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (4304T)
Washington DC 20460
202.566.2022 (office) 202.566.1140 (fax)

Lee Harrigan

Hi Everyone, One of our state member...

04/06/2010 01:09:29 PM

From: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US
To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Luis Cruz/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Charles
Delos/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com, wgal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us
Date: 04/06/2010 01:09 PM
Subject: WQSMA Thursday Sessions on ESA and Criteria Development

Hi Everyone,

One of our state members, Jennifer Wigal, is available to help plan the ESA session . However, she has to head home in the afternoon, mid-way through the session as it is currently scheduled .

I understand that the ESA session needs 90 minutes and that the criteria session may only need 3 hours. Here's how it would look with this change.

DAY THREE - Thursday, April 22		WITH 1/2 HOUR SWAP
8:30–11:30	Strategy for Criteria Development: Approach for Reviewing/Revising Existing Criteria <i>Linda Holst, Luis Cruz and Charlie Delos</i> Discussion to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Optimizing the current system of working with ORD• Strategies and outlook for updating old criteria and developing new criteria• Current barriers and ways to eliminate or minimize them• Regional efforts on criteria development and ways to improve coordination	
11:30–1:00	LUNCH (ON YOUR OWN)	

1:00–2:30	Endangered Species Act Consultations: Next Steps and Managing the 7(d) Backlog <i>Linda Holst and Wade Lehman</i> Session will include a discussion of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA’s next steps now that we have received the cyanide BO from the Services • Formal Regional Consultations - tips on approaches that have worked or don't work and for ensuring some level of consistency
2:30–3:00	Wrap Up & Adjourn

HOWEVER, Since you are already discussing tweaking the times , I wanted to ask whether it would be possible to hold the ESA session in the morning and the criteria session after lunch ? Here's how it could look with the change in time allotment and a switch in order .

DAY THREE - Thursday, April 22		OPTION B
8:30–10:00	Endangered Species Act Consultations: Next Steps and Managing the 7(d) Backlog <i>Linda Holst and Wade Lehman</i> Session will include a discussion of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA’s next steps now that we have received the cyanide BO from the Services • Formal Regional Consultations - tips on approaches that have worked or don't work and for ensuring some level of consistency 	
10:00–10:15	Break	
10:15–12:00	Strategy for Criteria Development: Approach for Reviewing/Revising Existing Criteria <i>Linda Holst, Luis Cruz and Charlie Delos</i> Discussion to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optimizing the current system of working with ORD • Strategies and outlook for updating old criteria and developing new criteria 	
12:00–1:30	LUNCH (ON YOUR OWN)	
1:30–2:30	Strategy for Criteria Development Continued: Approach for Reviewing/Revising Existing Criteria <i>Linda Holst, Luis Cruz and Charlie Delos</i> Discussion to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current barriers and ways to eliminate or minimize them • Regional efforts on criteria development and ways to improve coordination 	
2:30–3:00	Wrap Up & Adjourn	

Please let me know what you think!
Thanks,
Lee
566-1666

2016-005625-R5--9

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
04/06/2010 02:12 PM

To Joe Beaman, Linda Holst
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: ESA agenda and call-in details attached

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Wade

----- Forwarded by Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US on 04/06/2010 03:09 PM -----

From: Janita Aguirre/DC/USEPA/US
To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/01/2010 01:37 PM
Subject: Fw: ESA agenda and call-in details attached

----- Forwarded by Janita Aguirre/DC/USEPA/US on 04/01/2010 01:37 PM -----

From: Tom Marshall/DC/USEPA/US
To: Phyllis Feinmark/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Christopher Day/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Patrick Rankin/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Mike Thrift/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Craig Higgason/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Julie Walters/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Allen Demorest/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Denise Keehner/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Stein/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Ralph Abele/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Wil Wilson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Elaine Somers/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Dyner/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, MichaelG Lee/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Roger Gorke/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Tod Siegal/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Suzette Leith/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Laura Fujii/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, John Palmer/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Nicole Cantello/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Margaret Alkon/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Brian Thompson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Kellie Kubena/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Cara Steiner-Riley/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeff Kopf/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Jaslyn Dobrahner/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Susan Tennenbaum/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Lingard Knutson/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Fabiola Estrada/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Chris Kaczmarek/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Leigh DeHaven/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stefania Shamet/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Yeany/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Liu/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Jacobs/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Janita Aguirre/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Carol Holmes/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Tony Guadagno/DC/USEPA/US, Margaret Jones/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, William Puplampu/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Lynde Schoellkopf/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Aimee Hessert/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, David Berol/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Melissa Bagley/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Yerusha Beaver/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephanie Lamster/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Gretchen Busterud/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Jennifer Wills/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Deane Bartlett/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Kimi Matsumoto/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 04/01/2010 01:22 PM
Subject: ESA agenda and call-in details attached



ESA Monthly_agenda_4-10.doc

ph: (202) 564-5549

2016-005625-R5--10

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

04/06/2010 09:49 PM

To Wade Lehmann

cc Clair.Meehan, Lee Harrigan, "wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"

bcc

Subject Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked about. I only have some minor additions.

2. What does the cyanide consultation tell us about how the rest of the national consultation will go ... will it change the methodology or analysis, will it speed up or slow down the process for the next parameters?
3. What are next parameters for national consultation? Ammonia **{I would recommend that ammonia be next because of mussels and what we currently know about listed mussel sensitivity , i.e., pink mucket, listed species , SMAV is less than criteria and R 5 has comitted , with HQ's affirmation , to enter into formal consultation on ammonia with OH FWS }** What is the completion schedule for next parameters, at least from the BE standpoint?
4. What parameters have the literature searches been completed for? Can these be shared in a common database **{Candice recommends that completion of literature searches and their availability to regions be a priority because they are timeconsuming and entirely duplicative }**? Are they so old that they need to be updated? If so, who will do it and when?
5. How is EPA going to deal nationally (and regionally) with more and more BOs with reasonable and **prudent measures to ensure compliance ? Are we going to make states help us to comply ? Are we willing to promulgate where necessary , like maybe for ammonia ? What is our legal rational for promulgating or not promulgating where listed mussels are not protecte ?**

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology becuase of the different data and methods, ie., they are not traditional tox tests).

2. Are other regions planning or considering using national consultation method? How resource intensive has this been for OR and NJ (time, money)? Does it make sense for regions to be getting ahead on this? How can regions share this information more easily? **{Candice recommends the website thing Andy was talking about or something similar and that we start having regional workgroup /webinars to discuss using the methodology and describing tweaks and additional analyses that folks are using , as well as how FWS has responded . Also, I recommend that HQ provide a method to distribute relevant documents and software (national consultation models) so that Regions have latest information and software such that it is consistent with national consultation }**.

Data gathering plan

1. HQ needs to do/update this or share it if they have already done so AND fund it. Regions have seen nothing that I am aware of on this. **{Candice recommends that HQ and Regions identify priority parameters and species upon which we want tests and that HQ fund their collection through a central contract. Alternatively , HQ can give each region some funds to figure out their own priorities }**

Wade Lehmann I have made an attempt at a descriptiv...

04/06/2010 03:04:20 PM

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, "wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
<wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Cc: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com
Date: 04/06/2010 03:04 PM

Subject: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting later this month. Please read and recommend any fixes/improvements/etc. If you have specific items you would like to cover, please feel free to add them to the description. I will begin putting together an outline for the actual presentation that we can then work on together to cover all of our independent topics.

Please respond to all with any corrections/edits so that TT can get them into the program.

Thanks,
Wade

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, pesticide general permit informal consultation progress, and potential paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations, **including BE completion schedule for the next parameters**. We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level. In this block, we expect to cover ideas regarding an agency-wide workgroup for responding to ESA requirements in a consistent fashion and putting together a technical point-of-contact list for each unit within the Agency. Updates regarding how Regions and States are handling current consultations, the outlook for those consultations, **ways to share information**, and potential issues will be shared.

2016-005625-R5--11

David Pfeifer /R5/USEPA/US

04/07/2010 08:31 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc Linda Holst, pfeifer.david, poleck.thomas

bcc

Subject Re: ESA issues for Branch Chiefs meeting

Some thoughts:

1. Do we need a technical meeting for Regional and HQ ESA consultation technical staff to go over the current methodology and tools, workplans, who is doing what, what isn't getting done, prioritizing, sharing information, coordination, etc?
2. This seems like a place that could benefit from good contractor support (running models, doing lit searches)
3. Are there ways that regions and HQ can parse up the workload (i.e., HQ lead on cyanide, R5 lead on NH3 and mussels, R7 lead on chlorides...) [REDACTED]

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024

fax: 312-582-5164

e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

Candice Bauer

National Consultation 1. HQ needs to...

04/06/2010 09:54:27 AM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: pfeifer.david@epa.gov, poleck.thomas@epa.gov
Date: 04/06/2010 09:54 AM
Subject: ESA issues for Branch Chiefs meeting

National Consultation

1. HQ needs to describe national consultation for cyanide and FWS BO.
2. What does the cyanide consultation tell us about how the rest of the national consultation will go ... will it change the methodology or analysis, will it speed up or slow down the process for the next parameters?
3. What are next parameters for national consultation? [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing

so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology because of the different data and methods, ie., they are not traditional tox tests).

2. Are other regions planning or considering using national consultation method? How resource intensive has this been for OR and NJ (time, money)? Does it make sense for regions to be getting ahead on this? How can regions share this information more easily? {Candice recommends the website thing Andy was talking about or something similar and that we start having regional workgroup /webinars to discuss using the methodology and describing tweaks and additional analyses that folks are using, as well as how FWS has responded. Also, I recommend that HQ provide a method to distribute relevant documents and software (national consultation models) so that Regions have latest information and software such that it is consistent with national consultation }.

Data gathering plan

[REDACTED]

MOA promised CWA regulation revisions to better harmonize ESA and CWA.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
I am working on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday of each week
and will return any messages on my next work day.

2016-005625-R5--12

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
04/08/2010 10:47 AM

To "Meehan, Clair"
cc Lee Harrigan, Linda Holst, "wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
bcc
Subject RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

That was my intention Clair. Unless anyone else objects, I would recommend using the abbreviated paragraph. The alternative is to try to generate a few bullets (though they won't change much as I attempted to wrap in these topics) as per the criteria session.

Wade

"Meehan, Clair" Hi Linda, Wade, and Jennifer, I haven't... 04/08/2010 11:45:21 AM

From: "Meehan, Clair" <Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com>
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
<wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Date: 04/08/2010 11:45 AM
Subject: RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Hi Linda, Wade, and Jennifer,

I haven't seen a follow up to this email, and I wanted to touch base about it.

It seems like there are a few key discussion questions in Linda's email below, but these would take up a good amount of space on the agenda. My suggestion would be to include the paragraph Wade provided on the agenda, then print up and hand these discussion questions separately. Does that sound reasonable? Please let me know.

Thank you,
Clair

-----Original Message-----

From: Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 10:50 PM
To: Lehmann.Wade@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Meehan, Clair; Harrigan.Lee@epamail.epa.gov;
wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us
Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked about. I only have some minor additions.

2. What does the cyanide consultation tell us about how the rest of the national consultation will go... will it change the methodology or analysis, will it speed up or slow down the process for the next parameters?

3. What are next parameters for national consultation? Ammonia {I would recommend that ammonia be next because of mussels and what we currently know about listed mussel sensitivity, i.e., pink mucket, listed species, SMAV is less than criteria and R5 has committed, with HQ's affirmation, to enter into formal consultation on ammonia with OH

FWS}? What is the completion schedule for next parameters, at least from the BE standpoint?

4. What parameters have the literature searches been completed for? Can these be shared in a common database {Candice recommends that completion of literature searches and their availability to regions be a priority because they are timeconsuming and entirely duplicative}? Are they so old that they need to be updated? If so, who will do it and when?

5. How is EPA going to deal nationally (and regionally) with more and more BOs with reasonable and prudent measures to ensure compliance? Are we going to make states help us to comply? Are we willing to promulgate where necessary, like maybe for ammonia? What is our legal rational for promulgating or not promulgating where listed mussels are not protecte?

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology becuase of the different data and methods, ie., they are not traditional tox tests).

2. Are other regions planning or considering using national consultation method? How resource intensive has this been for OR and NJ (time, money)? Does it make sense for regions to be getting ahead on this? How can regions share this information more easily? {Candice recommends the website thing Andy was talking about or something similar and that we start having regional workgroup/webinars to discuss using the methodlogy and describing tweaks and additional analyses that folks are using, as well as how FWS has responded. Also, I recommend that HQ provide a method to distribute relevant documents and software (national consultation models) so that Regions have latest information and software such that it is consistent with national consultation}.

Data gathering plan

1. HQ needs to do/update this or share it if they have already done so AND fund it. Regions have seen nothing that I am aware of on this. {Candice recommends that HQ and Regions identify priority parameters and species upon which we want tests and that HQ fund their collection through a central contract. Alternatively, HQ can give each region some funds to figure out their own priorities.}

|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
----- |
|Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
|

>-----
----- |
|----->
| To: |
|----->

```

>-----
|-----|
|Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, "wical.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
<wical.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>|
|
>-----
|-----|
|----->
|Cc:|
|----->
|
>-----
|-----|
|Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com
|
|
>-----
|-----|
|----->
|Date:|
|----->
|
>-----
|-----|
|04/06/2010 03:04 PM
|
|
>-----
|-----|
|----->
|Subject:|
|----->
|
>-----
|-----|
|WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info
|
|
>-----
|-----|

```

I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting later this month. Please read and recommend any fixes/improvements/etc. If you have specific items you would like to cover, please feel free to add them to the description. I will begin putting together an outline for the actual presentation that we can then work on together to cover all of our independent topics.

Please respond to all with any corrections/edits so that TT can get them into the program.

Thanks,
Wade

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and

import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, pesticide general permit informal consultation progress, and potential paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations, including BE completion schedule for the next parameters. We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level. In this block, we expect to cover ideas regarding an agency-wide workgroup for responding to ESA requirements in a consistent fashion and putting together a technical point-of-contact list for each unit within the Agency. Updates regarding how Regions and States are handling current consultations, the outlook for those consultations, ways to share information, and potential issues will be shared.

2016-005625-R5--13

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

04/08/2010 11:54 AM

To "WIGAL Jennifer"

cc "Meehan, Clair", Lee Harrigan, Wade Lehmann

bcc

Subject RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

I assumed that's what he meant, but I agree, making it more explicit in the writeup would be helpful to let folks know we will be talking about that.

"WIGAL Jennifer"

I agree with this approach. The only...

04/08/2010 11:16:51 AM

From: "WIGAL Jennifer" <WIGAL.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Meehan, Clair" <Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com>
Cc: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/08/2010 11:16 AM
Subject: RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

I agree with this approach. The only thing I didn't see explicitly in your paragraph, Wade, was a connection to the cyanide BO and, based on EPA's analysis/reaction to it, how it affects future efforts, both nationally and regionally. This may be part of what you intended, but I think it would be helpful to note that will be part of the discussion.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lehmann.Wade@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Lehmann.Wade@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2010 8:48 AM

To: Meehan, Clair

Cc: Harrigan.Lee@epamail.epa.gov; Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov; WIGAL Jennifer

Subject: RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

That was my intention Clair. Unless anyone else objects, I would recommend using the abbreviated paragraph. The alternative is to try to generate a few bullets (though they won't change much as I attempted to wrap in these topics) as per the criteria session.

Wade

From: "Meehan, Clair" <Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com>

To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA,
"wical.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wical.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>

Date: 04/08/2010 11:45 AM

Subject: RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Hi Linda, Wade, and Jennifer,

I haven't seen a follow up to this email, and I wanted to touch base about it.

It seems like there are a few key discussion questions in Linda's email below, but these would take up a good amount of space on the agenda. My suggestion would be to include the paragraph Wade provided on the agenda, then print up and hand these discussion questions separately. Does that sound reasonable? Please let me know.

Thank you,
Clair

-----Original Message-----

From: Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 10:50 PM
To: Lehmann.Wade@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Meehan, Clair; Harrigan.Lee@epamail.epa.gov;
wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us
Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked about. I only have some minor additions.

2. What does the cyanide consultation tell us about how the rest of the national consultation will go... will it change the methodology or analysis, will it speed up or slow down the process for the next parameters?
3. What are next parameters for national consultation? Ammonia {I would recommend that ammonia be next because of mussels and what we currently know about listed mussel sensitivity, i.e., pink mucket, listed species, SMAV is less than criteria and R5 has committed, with HQ's affirmation, to enter into formal consultation on ammonia with OH FWS}? What is the completion schedule for next parameters, at least from the BE standpoint?
4. What parameters have the literature searches been completed for? Can these be shared in a common database {Candice recommends that completion of literature searches and their availability to regions be a priority because they are timeconsuming and entirely duplicative}? Are they so old that they need to be updated? If so, who will do it and when?
5. How is EPA going to deal nationally (and regionally) with more and more BOs with reasonable and prudent measures to ensure compliance? Are we going to make states help us to comply? Are we willing to promulgate where necessary, like maybe for ammonia? What is our legal rationale for promulgating or not promulgating where listed mussels are not protected?

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology because of the different data and methods, ie., they are not traditional tox tests).

2. Are other regions planning or considering using national consultation method? How resource intensive has this been for OR and NJ (time, money)? Does it make sense for regions to be getting ahead on this? How can regions share this information more easily? {Candice recommends the website thing Andy was talking about or something similar and that we start having regional workgroup/webinars to discuss using the methodology and describing tweaks and additional analyses that folks are using, as well as how FWS has responded. Also, I recommend that HQ provide a method to distribute relevant documents and software (national consultation models) so that Regions have latest information and software such that it is consistent with national consultation}.

Data gathering plan

1. HQ needs to do/update this or share it if they have already done so AND fund it. Regions have seen nothing that I am aware of on this. {Candice recommends that HQ and Regions identify priority parameters and species upon which we want tests and that HQ fund their collection through a central contract. Alternatively, HQ can give each region some funds to figure out their own priorities.}

```
|----->
| From:      |
|----->
```

```
>-----
----- |
```

```
|Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
|
```

```
>-----
----- |
```

```
|----->
| To:        |
|----->
```

```
>-----
----- |
```

```
|Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
<wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
|
```

```
>-----
----- |
```

```
|----->
```

| Cc: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

| Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com
|

>-----
----- |

|----->
| Date: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

| 04/06/2010 03:04 PM
|

>-----
----- |

|----->
| Subject: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

| WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info
|

>-----
----- |

I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting later this month. Please read and recommend any fixes/improvements/etc. If you have specific items you would like to cover, please feel free to add them to the description. I will begin putting together an outline for the actual presentation that we can then work on together to cover all of our independent topics.

Please respond to all with any corrections/edits so that TT can get them into the program.

Thanks,
Wade

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, pesticide general permit informal consultation progress, and potential

paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations, including BE completion schedule for the next parameters. We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level. In this block, we expect to cover ideas regarding an agency-wide workgroup for responding to ESA requirements in a consistent fashion and putting together a technical point-of-contact list for each unit within the Agency. Updates regarding how Regions and States are handling current consultations, the outlook for those consultations, ways to share information, and potential issues will be shared.

2016-005625-R5--14

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

04/08/2010 11:57 AM

To "Meehan, Clair"

cc Lee Harrigan, Wade Lehmann,
"wgal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"

bcc

Subject RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

I think the questions need to be consolidated, and putting them into a separate handout would be fine. I've had hardly any time to devote to any of this, unfortunately, but I should be given the task of shortening the questions.

Should we have a call sometime with John and the workgroup members to figure out how to run the session and id what we would like him to facilitate ?

"Meehan, Clair"

Hi Linda, Wade, and Jennifer, I haven't...

04/08/2010 10:45:21 AM

From: "Meehan, Clair" <Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com>
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "wgal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
<wgal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Date: 04/08/2010 10:45 AM
Subject: RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Hi Linda, Wade, and Jennifer,

I haven't seen a follow up to this email, and I wanted to touch base about it.

It seems like there are a few key discussion questions in Linda's email below, but these would take up a good amount of space on the agenda. My suggestion would be to include the paragraph Wade provided on the agenda, then print up and hand these discussion questions separately. Does that sound reasonable? Please let me know.

Thank you,
Clair

-----Original Message-----

From: Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 10:50 PM
To: Lehmann.Wade@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Meehan, Clair; Harrigan.Lee@epamail.epa.gov;
wgal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us
Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked about. I only have some minor additions.

2. What does the cyanide consultation tell us about how the rest of the national consultation will go... will it change the methodology or analysis, will it speed up or slow down the process for the next parameters?

3. What are next parameters for national consultation? Ammonia {I would recommend that ammonia be next because of mussels and what we currently know about listed mussel sensitivity, i.e., pink mucket, listed species, SMAV is less than criteria and R5 has comitted, with

HQ's affirmation, to enter into formal consultation on ammonia with OH FWS}? What is the completion schedule for next parameters, at least from the BE standpoint?

4. What parameters have the literature searches been completed for? Can these be shared in a common database {Candice recommends that completion of literature searches and their availability to regions be a priority because they are timeconsuming and entirely duplicative}? Are they so old that they need to be updated? If so, who will do it and when?

5. How is EPA going to deal nationally (and regionally) with more and more BOs with reasonable and prudent measures to ensure compliance? Are we going to make states help us to comply? Are we willing to promulgate where necessary, like maybe for ammonia? What is our legal rational for promulgating or not promulgating where listed mussels are not protecte?

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology becuase of the different data and methods, ie., they are not traditional tox tests).

2. Are other regions planning or considering using national consultation method? How resource intensive has this been for OR and NJ (time, money)? Does it make sense for regions to be getting ahead on this? How can regions share this information more easily? {Candice recommends the website thing Andy was talking about or something similar and that we start having regional workgroup/webinars to discuss using the methodlogy and describing tweaks and additional analyses that folks are using, as well as how FWS has responded. Also, I recommend that HQ provide a method to distribute relevant documents and software (national consultation models) so that Regions have latest information and software such that it is consistent with national consultation}.

Data gathering plan

1. HQ needs to do/update this or share it if they have already done so AND fund it. Regions have seen nothing that I am aware of on this. {Candice recommends that HQ and Regions identify priority parameters and species upon which we want tests and that HQ fund their collection through a central contract. Alternatively, HQ can give each region some funds to figure out their own priorities.}

|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
----- |
|Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
|

>-----
----- |
|----->
| To: |
|----->

```

>-----
|-----|
| Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
| <wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us> |
|-----
>-----
|-----|
|----->
| Cc: |
|----->
>-----
|-----|
| Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com
|
|-----
>-----
|-----|
|----->
| Date: |
|----->
>-----
|-----|
| 04/06/2010 03:04 PM
|
>-----
|-----|
|----->
| Subject: |
|----->
>-----
|-----|
| WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info
|
>-----
|-----|

```

I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting later this month. Please read and recommend any fixes/improvements/etc. If you have specific items you would like to cover, please feel free to add them to the description. I will begin putting together an outline for the actual presentation that we can then work on together to cover all of our independent topics.

Please respond to all with any corrections/edits so that TT can get them into the program.

Thanks,
Wade

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide

biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, pesticide general permit informal consultation progress, and potential paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations, including BE completion schedule for the next parameters. We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level. In this block, we expect to cover ideas regarding an agency-wide workgroup for responding to ESA requirements in a consistent fashion and putting together a technical point-of-contact list for each unit within the Agency. Updates regarding how Regions and States are handling current consultations, the outlook for those consultations, ways to share information, and potential issues will be shared.

2016-005625-R5--15

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
04/08/2010 01:16 PM

To Linda Holst
cc "Meehan, Clair", Lee Harrigan,
"wgal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
bcc
Subject RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

I plan on taking a crack at the first draft of a presentation Friday (and possibly Monday). Once that draft is mostly in hand, I would like to send it around to everyone for comment. I believe a phone call would be best if organized for once the three of us have had a chance to edit and add to the presentation. It should clarify where any gaps exist and bring forward the questions to be discussed. We can preface the presentation with the list of concerns and ask attendees to bring up additional items that they have on hand.

For the regional and state concerns, I will let each of you draft any additional items and we can then decide how to break up the session. I would like to see everything set out in an orderly way before trying to establish other details.

Wade

Linda Holst | I think the questions need to be consoli... | 04/08/2010 12:58:23 PM

From: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US
To: "Meehan, Clair" <Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com>
Cc: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA,
"wgal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wgal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Date: 04/08/2010 12:58 PM
Subject: RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

I think the questions need to be consolidated, and putting them into a separate handout would be fine. I've had hardly any time to devote to any of this, unfortunately, but I should be given the task of shortening the questions.

Should we have a call sometime with John and the workgroup members to figure out how to run the session and id what we would like him to facilitate ?

"Meehan, Clair" | Hi Linda, Wade, and Jennifer, I haven't... | 04/08/2010 10:45:21 AM

2016-005625-R5--16

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
04/08/2010 01:30 PM

To "Meehan, Clair"
cc Lee Harrigan, Linda Holst, "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
bcc
Subject RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Clair,
Please flip the sentence you added to be the second one for the paragraph:

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. This discussion will also cover the cyanide BO and, based on EPA's analysis/reaction to it, how it affects future efforts, both nationally and regionally. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national

"Meehan, Clair"	In order to capture the comments mad...	04/08/2010 02:24:22 PM
-----------------	---	------------------------

From:	"Meehan, Clair" <Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com>
To:	Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc:	Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Date:	04/08/2010 02:24 PM
Subject:	RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

In order to capture the comments made by Jennifer and Linda, I've added one final sentence to Wade's paragraph:

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, pesticide general permit informal consultation progress, and potential paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations, including BE completion schedule for the next parameters. We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level. In this block, we expect to cover ideas regarding an agency-wide workgroup for responding to ESA requirements in a consistent fashion and putting together a technical point-of-contact list for each unit within the Agency. Updates regarding how Regions and States are handling current consultations, the outlook for those consultations, ways to share information, and potential issues will be shared. This discussion will also cover the cyanide BO and, based on EPA's analysis/reaction to it, how it affects future efforts, both nationally and regionally.

If you have any changes, please let me know by 4:00 pm today.

Linda, if you plan to shorten the questions, we just need to have those by next Wednesday, April 14.

I'd be happy to help set up a conference call with John (the facilitator)—just let me know when you'll be ready for that.

Thank you!
Clair

-----Original Message-----

From: Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2010 12:58 PM
To: Meehan, Clair
Cc: Harrigan.Lee@epamail.epa.gov; Lehmann.Wade@epamail.epa.gov;
wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us
Subject: RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

I think the questions need to be consolidated, and putting them into a separate handout would be fine. I've had hardly any time to devote to any of this, unfortunately, but I should be given the task of shortening the questions.

Should we have a call sometime with John and the workgroup members to figure out how to run the session and id what we would like him to facilitate?

```
|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
----- |
| "Meehan, Clair" <Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com>
|

>-----
----- |
|----->
| To: |
|----->

>-----
----- |
| Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
|

>-----
----- |
```

```
|----->
| Cc: |
|----->

>-----
----- |
| Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "wical.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
<wical.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
|

>-----
----- |

|----->
| Date: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

| 04/08/2010 10:45 AM
|

>-----
----- |

|----->
| Subject: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

| RE: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info
|

>-----
----- |
```

Hi Linda, Wade, and Jennifer,

I haven't seen a follow up to this email, and I wanted to touch base about it.

It seems like there are a few key discussion questions in Linda 's email below, but these would take up a good amount of space on the agenda . My suggestion would be to include the paragraph Wade provided on the agenda, then print up and hand these discussion questions separately . Does that sound reasonable? Please let me know.

Thank you,
Clair

-----Original Message-----

From: Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 10:50 PM
To: Lehmann.Wade@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Meehan, Clair; Harrigan.Lee@epamail.epa.gov;
wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us
Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked about. I only have some minor additions.

2. What does the cyanide consultation tell us about how the rest of the national consultation will go... will it change the methodology or analysis, will it speed up or slow down the process for the next parameters?

3. What are next parameters for national consultation? Ammonia {I would recommend that ammonia be next because of mussels and what we currently know about listed mussel sensitivity, i.e., pink mucket, listed species, SMAV is less than criteria and R5 has committed, with HQ's affirmation, to enter into formal consultation on ammonia with OH FWS}? What is the completion schedule for next parameters, at least from the BE standpoint?

4. What parameters have the literature searches been completed for? Can these be shared in a common database {Candice recommends that completion of literature searches and their availability to regions be a priority because they are timeconsuming and entirely duplicative}? Are they so old that they need to be updated? If so, who will do it and when?

5. How is EPA going to deal nationally (and regionally) with more and more BOs with reasonable and prudent measures to ensure compliance? Are we going to make states help us to comply? Are we willing to promulgate where necessary, like maybe for ammonia? What is our legal rationale for promulgating or not promulgating where listed mussels are not protected?

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology because of the different data and methods, i.e., they are not traditional tox tests).

2. Are other regions planning or considering using national

consultation method? How resource intensive has this been for OR and NJ (time, money)? Does it make sense for regions to be getting ahead on this? How can regions share this information more easily? {Candice recommends the website thing Andy was talking about or something similar and that we start having regional workgroup/webinars to discuss using the methodology and describing tweaks and additional analyses that folks are using, as well as how FWS has responded. Also, I recommend that HQ provide a method to distribute relevant documents and software (national consultation models) so that Regions have latest information and software such that it is consistent with national consultation}.

Data gathering plan

1. HQ needs to do/update this or share it if they have already done so AND fund it. Regions have seen nothing that I am aware of on this. {Candice recommends that HQ and Regions identify priority parameters and species upon which we want tests and that HQ fund their collection through a central contract. Alternatively, HQ can give each region some funds to figure out their own priorities.}

|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

|Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
|

>-----
----- |

|----->
| To: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

|Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, "wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
<wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
|

>-----
----- |

|----->
| Cc: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

|Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com
|

>-----
----- |

|----->
| Date: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

|04/06/2010 03:04 PM
|

>-----
----- |

|----->
| Subject: |
|----->

>-----
----- |

|WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info
|

>-----
----- |

I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting later this month. Please read and recommend any fixes/improvements/etc. If you have specific items you would like to cover, please feel free to add them to the description. I will begin putting together an outline for the actual presentation that we can then work on together to cover all of our independent topics.

Please respond to all with any corrections /edits so that TT can get them into the program.

Thanks,

Wade

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, pesticide general permit informal consultation progress, and potential paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations, including BE completion schedule for the next parameters. We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level. In this block, we expect to cover ideas regarding an agency-wide workgroup for responding to ESA requirements in a consistent fashion and putting together a technical point-of-contact list for each unit within the Agency. Updates regarding how Regions and States are handling current consultations, the outlook for those consultations, ways to share information, and potential issues will be shared.

2016-005625-R5--17

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

04/09/2010 02:32 PM

To Wade Lehmann

cc "wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"

bcc

Subject Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Changes are below. Thanks for pulling this together.

Wade Lehmann

Preliminary outline of the ESA present...

04/09/2010 10:09:34 AM

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Date: 04/09/2010 10:09 AM
Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Preliminary outline of the ESA presentation. I attempted to roll in the questions posed by R5. so give it a look and see - keep in mind this is outline and will be expanded. Please make comments or add to it as you see fit. I am spending this afternoon filling in the details and getting slides made, hopefully to pass to the group on Monday.

1.Cyanide BO

1.Status

2.Immediate reactions (need EK input) from HQ

1.Technical/risk assessment

2.Scope/policy/RPA

3.Effects on future efforts

3.Processing of future consultations

2.Next National consultation

1.Potential next chemical

2.timing

3.Criteria updates: Information Sharing

4.RPA's: future issues and potential actions

5.Inter-agency workgroup & charter

6.Formation of EPA-wide ESA technical group

1.Rep(s) from each region + HQ (owm, ost/hecd)

7.methods manual and future of consultations

1.Monies from HQ

2.Potential updates to manual

3.Use of the methods

8.Regional BE derivation

1.Existing / active consultations

1.OR toxics

2. OH designated use changes (DO, temp., pH, ammonia, cyanide and chlorine criteria)

3. IL/IN sulfates

4. MN lake eutrophication and herbicide (metallochlor, acetachlor) criteria

5. MI mercury statewide variance procedures

6. WI chloride and mercury variances
7. R7 chloride criteria (based upon draft criteria document)

2. Forthcoming consultations

1. WI thermal criteria (adopted, not yet approved)
2. WI phosphorus criteria for lakes and rivers/streams (proposed)
3. IL criteria (boron, fluoride, manganese)
4. MN nitrate and river/stream eutrophication criteria
5. OH phosphorus and nitrate+nitrite (eutrophication) criteria for streams

3. Lessons learned, items to include

9. State efforts

1. Existing/active/forthcoming consultations

~~1. OH — DU changes/differing criteria~~

2. Expected outcomes

Linda Holst	Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on w...	04/06/2010 10:50:02 PM
Wade Lehmann	I have made an attempt at a descriptiv...	04/06/2010 03:04:20 PM

2016-005625-R5--18

**Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US**
04/12/2010 07:34 AM

To Linda Holst
cc "wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
bcc
Subject WQSMA ppt for ESA section

So as not to interrupt progress, I have attached the powerpoint as it currently exists. I have not yet filled in all of the details, but it is close from the HQ perspective. I have left blank slides for Regional/State issues at the end that can be copied to add more slides, so please add in whatever you wished to discuss.

The first slide is the current outline. The second is a list of questions I would like to have distributed to the incoming folks by later this week (please add anything you feel we could use a response on!).

Please send your versions back to me and I will track the changes and make sure its one cohesive presentations.

Oh - I also just received the completed sw NJ nickel consultation that I will review and throw in some details - as its possible the first concurrence ever?

Cheers,
Wade

Wade Lehmann, PhD
Ecological Risk Assessment Branch
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science & Technology, Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (4304T)
Washington DC 20460
202.566.2022 (office) 202.566.1140 (fax)

-----Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
From: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US
Date: 04/09/2010 03:32PM
cc: "wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Changes are below. Thanks for pulling this together.

Wade Lehmann---04/09/2010 10:09:34 AM---Preliminary outline of the ESA presentation. I attempted to roll in the questions posed by R5. so g

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Date: 04/09/2010 10:09 AM

Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Preliminary outline of the ESA presentation. I attempted to roll in the questions posed by R5. so give it a look and see - keep in mind this is outline and will be expanded. Please make comments or add to it as you see fit. I am spending this afternoon filling in the details and getting slides made, hopefully to pass to the group on Monday.

1.Cyanide BO

1.Status

2.Immediate reactions (need EK input) from HQ

1.Technical/risk assessment

2.Scope/policy/RPA

3.Effects on future efforts

3.Processing of future consultations

2.Next National consultation

1.Potential next chemical

2.timing

3.Criteria updates: Information Sharing

4.RPA's: future issues and potential actions

5.Inter-agency workgroup & charter

6.Formation of EPA-wide ESA technical group

1.Rep(s) from each region + HQ (owm, ost/hecd)

7.methods manual and future of consultations

1.Monies from HQ

2.Potential updates to manual

3.Use of the methods

8.Regional BE derivation

1.Existing / active consultations

1. OR toxics

2. OH designated use changes (DO, temp., pH, ammonia, cyanide and chlorine criteria)
3. IL/IN sulfates
4. MN lake eutrophication and herbicide (metalochlor, acetachlor) criteria
5. MI mercury statewide variance procedures
6. WI chloride and mercury variances
7. R7 chloride criteria (based upon draft criteria document)

2. Forthcoming consultations

1. WI thermal criteria (adopted, not yet approved)
2. WI phosphorus criteria for lakes and rivers/streams (proposed)
3. IL criteria (boron, fluoride, manganese)
4. MN nitrate and river/stream eutrophication criteria
5. OH phosphorus and nitrate+nitrite (eutrophication) criteria for streams

3.Lessons learned, items to include

9.State efforts

1.Existing/active/forthcoming consultations

~~1.OH—DU changes/differing criteria~~

2.Expected outcomes

Linda Holst---04/06/2010 10:50:02 PM---Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked a

From: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com, Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "wigan.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wigan.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>

Date: 04/06/2010 10:50 PM

Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked about. I only have some minor additions.

2. What does the cyanide consultation tell us about how the rest of the national consultation will go ... will it change the methodology or analysis, will it speed up or slow down the process for the next parameters?
3. What are next parameters for national consultation? Ammonia { I would recommend that ammonia be next because of mussels and what we currently know about listed mussel sensitivity , i.e., pink mucket, listed species , SMAV is less than criteria and R 5 has committed , with HQ's affirmation , to enter into formal consultation on ammonia with OH FWS }? What is the completion schedule for next parameters, at least from the BE standpoint?
4. What parameters have the literature searches been completed for? Can these be shared in a common database { Candice recommends that completion of literature searches and their availability to regions be a priority because they are timeconsuming and entirely duplicative }? Are they so old that they need to be updated? If so, who will do it and when?
5. How is EPA going to deal nationally (and regionally) with more and more BOs with reasonable and prudent measures to ensure compliance ? Are we going to make states help us to comply ? Are we willing to promulgate where necessary , like maybe for ammonia ? What is our legal rationale for promulgating or not promulgating where listed mussels are not protected ?

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology because of the different data and methods, i.e., they are not traditional tox tests).
2. Are other regions planning or considering using national consultation method? How resource intensive has this been for OR and NJ (time, money)? Does it make sense for regions to be getting ahead on this? How can regions share this information more easily? { Candice recommends the website thing Andy was talking about or something similar and that we start having regional workgroup /webinars to discuss using the methodology and describing tweaks and additional analyses that folks are using , as well as how FWS has responded . Also, I recommend that HQ provide a method to distribute relevant documents and software (national consultation models) so that Regions have latest information and software such that it is consistent with national consultation }.

Data gathering plan

1. HQ needs to do/update this or share it if they have already done so AND fund it. Regions have seen nothing that I am aware of on this. { Candice recommends that HQ and Regions identify priority parameters and species upon which we want tests and that HQ fund their collection through a central contract. Alternatively , HQ can give each region some funds to figure out their own priorities . }

Wade Lehmann---04/06/2010 03:04:20 PM---I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US

To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>

Cc: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com

Date: 04/06/2010 03:04 PM

Subject: WQSMa paragraph for ESA section and info

I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting later this month. Please read and recommend any fixes/improvements/etc. If you have specific items you would like to cover, please feel free to add them to the description. I will begin putting together an outline for the actual presentation that we can then work on together to cover all of our independent topics.

Please respond to all with any corrections/edits so that TT can get them into the program.

Thanks,
Wade

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, pesticide general permit informal consultation progress, and potential paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations , **including BE completion schedule for the next parameters** . We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level. In this block, we expect to cover ideas regarding an agency-wide workgroup for responding to ESA requirements in a consistent fashion and putting together a technical point-of-contact list for each unit within the Agency. Updates regarding how Regions and States are handling current consultations, the outlook for those consultations, **ways to share information**, and potential issues will be shared.



ESA WQSMA April 2010.ppt

2016-005625-R5--19

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
04/13/2010 08:21 AM

To "WIGAL Jennifer"
cc Linda Holst
bcc
Subject RE: WQSMA ppt for ESA section

While not detailed in the slides, I do plan to cover what I can regarding the topics and highlights in your email. My intention is an information update on where OW & EPA are in the process of national consultations and the potential impacts to regional/state consultations.

I'll have to pass the presentation through our general counsel as well as the office director, so the content may shift and I may not be allowed to speak on some specific items, but I will relay what I can.

Jennifer, did you have anything specific you wanted to cover or ask? If so, please add to the list of questions at the beginning of the presentation (that will go out to attendees this week) or add slides. Anything regarding the OR Toxics work specifically that would be worth relating?

The first slide is just for our purposes in filling out the presentation and will not be shared. This was to assist all 3 of us in building the presentation.

Wade

Wade Lehmann, PhD
Ecological Risk Assessment Branch
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science & Technology, Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (4304T)
Washington DC 20460
202.566.2022 (office) 202.566.1140 (fax)

"WIGAL Jennifer"

Wade, Thanks for the preview of the...

04/12/2010 06:26:15 PM

From: "WIGAL Jennifer" <WIGAL.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/12/2010 06:26 PM
Subject: RE: WQSMA ppt for ESA section

Wade,

Thanks for the preview of the presentation. I have a few questions, thoughts and suggestions based on your outline:

First, what are we looking for from the managers group as a result of this presentation? After looking at the presentation outline, I re-read the paragraph you drafted, and realized I don't have a clear sense of what we are asking them for. Is this just an overview presentation? Is there something specific EPA would like feedback on (in addition to getting volunteers for the EPA response group), given where things stand? I would suggest updating the overview paragraph in the final agenda (if time remains) and

putting the objectives of the presentation on the first slide, including what you're asking from the people viewing the presentation.

Also, in terms of setting the stage for the information presented, for me, being from the state and not being immersed in all of this stuff all the time, it would be interesting if the presentation started off with some kind of statement about the current objective of the Agency regarding that national consultation effort. Is it still full-steam ahead? Full-commitment on the part of EPA and the Services (to the best of your knowledge on the latter)? If yes, regardless of cost? Regardless of the remaining issues that remain to be sorted out? Have you stated any or thought about alternative paths? What is the relationship between the BO EPA has just received and any alternative paths EPA is thinking about? (This could involve anything from giving up, to doggedly pursuing the current path, etc.) Starting off with this kind of summary would be good, I think for those of us in the room that are not up-to-date on all the efforts and would help us frame any input you wish to get from us.

With regard to the first two slides, are you intending to use those as handouts? Given the level of detail, that is what I would suggest, if that's not what you are already thinking.

Again, thanks for the opportunity to provide some input. Feel free to get in touch with me if anything is not clear.

Jennifer

From: Lehmann.Wade@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Lehmann.Wade@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2010 5:34 AM
To: Holst.Linda@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: WIGAL Jennifer
Subject: WQSMA ppt for ESA section

So as not to interrupt progress, I have attached the powerpoint as it currently exists. I have not yet filled in all of the details, but it is close from the HQ perspective. I have left blank slides for Regional/State issues at the end that can be copied to add more slides, so please add in whatever you wished to discuss.

The first slide is the current outline. The second is a list of questions I would like to have distributed to the incoming folks by later this week (please add anything you feel we could use a response on!).

Please send your versions back to me and I will track the changes and make sure its one cohesive presentations.

Oh - I also just received the completed sw NJ nickel consultation that I will review and throw in some details - as its possible the first concurrence ever?

Cheers,
Wade

Wade Lehmann, PhD
Ecological Risk Assessment Branch
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science & Technology, Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (4304T)
Washington DC 20460
202.566.2022 (office) 202.566.1140 (fax)

-----Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
From: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US
Date: 04/09/2010 03:32PM
cc: "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Changes are below. Thanks for pulling this together.

Wade Lehmann---04/09/2010 10:09:34 AM---Preliminary outline of the ESA presentation. I attempted to roll in the questions posed by R5. so g

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Date: 04/09/2010 10:09 AM
Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Preliminary outline of the ESA presentation. I attempted to roll in the questions posed by R5. so give it a look and see - keep in mind this is outline and will be expanded. Please make comments or add to it as you see fit. I am spending this afternoon filling in the details and getting slides made, hopefully to pass to the group on Monday.

1.Cyanide BO

1.Status

2.Immediate reactions (need EK input) from HQ

1.Technical/risk assessment

2.Scope/policy/RPA

3.Effects on future efforts

3.Processing of future consultations

2.Next National consultation

1.Potential next chemical

2.timing

3.Criteria updates: Information Sharing

4.RPA's: future issues and potential actions

5.Inter-agency workgroup & charter

6.Formation of EPA-wide ESA technical group

1.Rep(s) from each region + HQ (owm, ost/hecd)

7.methods manual and future of consultations

1.Monies from HQ

2.Potential updates to manual

3.Use of the methods

8.Regional BE derivation

1.Existing / active consultations

1. OR toxics

2. OH designated use changes (DO, temp., pH, ammonia, cyanide and chlorine criteria)

3. IL/IN sulfates

4. MN lake eutrophication and herbicide (metolochlor, acetachlor) criteria

5. MI mercury statewide variance procedures

6. WI chloride and mercury variances

7. R7 chloride criteria (based upon draft criteria document)

2. Forthcoming consultations

1. WI thermal criteria (adopted, not yet approved)

2. WI phosphorus criteria for lakes and rivers/streams (proposed)

3. IL criteria (boron, fluoride, manganese)

4. MN nitrate and river/stream eutrophication criteria
5. OH phosphorus and nitrate+nitrite (eutrophication) criteria for streams

3. Lessons learned, items to include

9. State efforts

1. Existing/active/forthcoming consultations

~~1. OH—DU changes/differing criteria~~

2. Expected outcomes

Linda Holst---04/06/2010 10:50:02 PM---Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked a

From: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com, Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>

Date: 04/06/2010 10:50 PM

Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked about. I only have some minor additions.

2. What does the cyanide consultation tell us about how the rest of the national consultation will go... will it change the methodology or analysis, will it speed up or slow down the process for the next parameters?

3. What are next parameters for national consultation? Ammonia { **I would recommend that ammonia be next because of mussels and what we currently know about listed mussel sensitivity, i.e., pink mucket, listed species, SMAV is less than criteria and R5 has committed, with HQ's affirmation, to enter into formal consultation on ammonia with OH FWS** }? What is the completion schedule for next parameters, at least from the BE standpoint?

4. What parameters have the literature searches been completed for? Can these be shared in a common database { **Candice recommends that completion of literature searches and their availability to regions be a priority because they are timeconsuming and entirely duplicative** }? Are they so old that they need to be updated? If so, who will do it and when?

5. How is EPA going to deal nationally (and regionally) with more and more BOs with reasonable and prudent measures to ensure compliance? Are we going to make states help us to comply? Are we willing to promulgate where necessary, like maybe for ammonia? What is our legal rationale for promulgating or not promulgating where listed mussels are not protected?

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology because of the different data and methods, i.e., they are not traditional tox tests).

2. Are other regions planning or considering using national consultation method? How resource intensive has this been for OR and NJ (time, money)? Does it make sense for regions to be getting ahead on this? How can regions share this information more easily? { **Candice recommends the website thing Andy was talking about or something similar and that we start having regional workgroup/webinars to discuss using the methodology and describing tweaks and additional analyses that folks are using, as well as how FWS has responded. Also, I recommend that HQ provide a method to distribute relevant documents and software (national consultation models) so that Regions have latest information and software such that it is consistent with national consultation** }.

Data gathering plan

1. HQ needs to do/update this or share it if they have already done so AND fund it. Regions have seen nothing that I am aware of on this. { **Candice recommends that HQ and Regions identify priority parameters and species upon which we want tests and that HQ fund their collection through a central contract. Alternatively, HQ can give each region some funds to figure out their own priorities.** }

Wade Lehmann---04/06/2010 03:04:20 PM---I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US

To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>

Cc: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com

Date: 04/06/2010 03:04 PM

Subject: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting later this month. Please read and recommend any fixes/improvements/etc. If you have specific items you would like to cover, please feel free to add them to the description. I will begin putting together an outline for the actual presentation that we can then work on together to cover all of our independent topics.

Please respond to all with any corrections/edits so that TT can get them into the program.

Thanks,
Wade

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, pesticide general permit informal consultation progress, and potential paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations , including BE completion schedule for the next parameters . We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level. In this block, we expect to cover ideas regarding an agency-wide workgroup for responding to ESA requirements in a consistent fashion and putting together a technical point-of-contact list for each unit within the Agency. Updates regarding how Regions and States are handling current consultations, the outlook for those consultations, ways to share information, and potential issues will be shared.

2016-005625-R5--20

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

04/13/2010 11:22 AM

To Wade Lehmann

cc "wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us", Clair.Meehan, Lee Harrigan
bcc

Subject Re: WQSMA ppt for ESA section

Wade -- I wanted to let you know that I'm not going to get to my presentation before this weekend, so I will bring it on a thumb drive, and we'll just have to switch over during the session. The same will be true for the criteria presentation.

Linda

Wade Lehmann So as not to interrupt progress, I have...

04/12/2010 07:34:10 AM

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Date: 04/12/2010 07:34 AM
Subject: WQSMA ppt for ESA section

So as not to interrupt progress, I have attached the powerpoint as it currently exists. I have not yet filled in all of the details, but it is close from the HQ perspective. I have left blank slides for Regional/State issues at the end that can be copied to add more slides, so please add in whatever you wished to discuss.

The first slide is the current outline. The second is a list of questions I would like to have distributed to the incoming folks by later this week (please add anything you feel we could use a response on!).

Please send your versions back to me and I will track the changes and make sure its one cohesive presentations.

Oh - I also just received the completed sw NJ nickel consultation that I will review and throw in some details - as its possible the first concurrence ever?

Cheers,
Wade

Wade Lehmann, PhD
Ecological Risk Assessment Branch
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science & Technology, Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (4304T)
Washington DC 20460
202.566.2022 (office) 202.566.1140 (fax)

-----Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
From: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US
Date: 04/09/2010 03:32PM
cc: "wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wiga1.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info

Changes are below. Thanks for pulling this together.

Wade Lehmann---04/09/2010 10:09:34 AM---Preliminary outline of the ESA presentation. I attempted to roll in the questions posed by R5. so g

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
Date: 04/09/2010 10:09 AM
Subject: Re: WQSMa paragraph for ESA section and info

Preliminary outline of the ESA presentation. I attempted to roll in the questions posed by R5. so give it a look and see - keep in mind this is outline and will be expanded. Please make comments or add to it as you see fit. I am spending this afternoon filling in the details and getting slides made, hopefully to pass to the group on Monday.

1.Cyanide BO

1.Status

2.Immediate reactions (need EK input) from HQ

1.Technical/risk assessment

2.Scope/policy/RPA

3.Effects on future efforts

3.Processing of future consultations

2.Next National consultation

1.Potential next chemical

2.timing

3.Criteria updates: Information Sharing

4.RPA's: future issues and potential actions

5.Inter-agency workgroup & charter

6.Formation of EPA-wide ESA technical group

1.Rep(s) from each region + HQ (owm, ost/hecd)

7.methods manual and future of consultations

1.Monies from HQ

2.Potential updates to manual

3.Use of the methods

8.Regional BE derivation

1.Existing / active consultations

1. OR toxics

2. OH designated use changes (DO, temp., pH, ammonia, cyanide and chlorine criteria)

3. IL/IN sulfates

4. MN lake eutrophication and herbicide (metalochlor, acetachlor) criteria

5. MI mercury statewide variance procedures

6. WI chloride and mercury variances

7. R7 chloride criteria (based upon draft criteria document)

2. Forthcoming consultations

1. WI thermal criteria (adopted, not yet approved)

2. WI phosphorus criteria for lakes and rivers/streams (proposed)

3. IL criteria (boron, fluoride, manganese)

4. MN nitrate and river/stream eutrophication criteria

5. OH phosphorus and nitrate+nitrite (eutrophication) criteria for streams

3.Lessons learned, items to include

9.State efforts

1.Existing/active/forthcoming consultations

~~1. OH DU changes/differing criteria~~

2.Expected outcomes

From: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com, Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>

Date: 04/06/2010 10:50 PM

Subject: Re: WQSMA paragraph for ESA section and info
t:

Wade - Thanks for taking the lead on writing up the paragraph. I think it includes what we talked about. I only have some minor additions.

2. What does the cyanide consultation tell us about how the rest of the national consultation will go ... will it change the methodology or analysis, will it speed up or slow down the process for the next parameters?
3. What are next parameters for national consultation? Ammonia { I would recommend that ammonia be next because of mussels and what we currently know about listed mussel sensitivity , i.e., pink mucket, listed species , SMAV is less than criteria and R 5 has comitted , with HQ's affirmation , to enter into formal consultation on ammonia with OH FWS }? What is the completion schedule for next parameters, at least from the BE standpoint?
4. What parameters have the literature searches been completed for? Can these be shared in a common database { Candice recommends that completion of literature searches and their availability to regions be a priority because they are timeconsuming and entirely duplicative }? Are they so old that they need to be updated? If so, who will do it and when?
5. How is EPA going to deal nationally (and regionally) with more and more BOs with reasonable and prudent measures to ensure compliance ? Are we going to make states help us to comply ? Are we willing to promulgate where necessary , like maybe for ammonia ? What is our legal rational for promulgating or not promulgating where listed mussels are not protecte ?

Regional Consultations

1. Several regions are or plan to use the national methodology for consultation purposes (Oregon is doing so for several toxics, NJ has just completed a BE for cyanide and nickel (I think), and R7 and R5 have been told by FWS to use the national methodology for ongoing consultations on sulfate, chloride, and perhaps other parameters, R5 has agreed to formal consultation on OH ammonia, cyanide and chlorine that may follow national methodology (temp, DO, and pH are also to be consulted upon but will not use ICE-SSD models as called for in national methodology becuase of the different data and methods, ie., they are not traditional tox tests).
2. Are other regions planning or considering using national consultation method? How resource intensive has this been for OR and NJ (time, money)? Does it make sense for regions to be getting ahead on this? How can regions share this information more easily? { Candice recommends the website thing Andy was talking about or something similar and that we start having regional workgroup /webinars to discuss using the methodology and describing tweaks and additional analyses that folks are using , as well as how FWS has responded . Also, I recommend that HQ provide a method to distribute relevant documents and software (national consultation models) so that Regions have latest information and software such that it is consistent with national consultation }.

Data gathering plan

1. HQ needs to do/update this or share it if they have already done so AND fund it. Regions have seen nothing that I am aware of on this. { Candice recommends that HQ and Regions identify priority parameters and species upon which we want tests and that HQ fund their collection through a central contract. Alternatively , HQ can give each region some funds to figure out their own priorities . }

Wade Lehmann---04/06/2010 03:04:20 PM---I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US

To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, "wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <wiga.jennifer@deq.state.or.us>

Cc: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com

Date: 04/06/2010 03:04 PM

Subject: WQSMa paragraph for ESA section and info

I have made an attempt at a descriptive paragraph for our ESA issues section of the upcoming meeting later this month. Please read and recommend any fixes/improvements/etc. If you have specific items you would like to cover, please feel free to add them to the description. I will begin putting together an outline for the actual presentation that we can then work on together to cover all of our independent topics.

Please respond to all with any corrections/edits so that TT can get them into the program.

Thanks,
Wade

The FWS has provided EPA with their final draft of the cyanide biological opinion. We will give a brief update on the status and import of national consultations in general, the inter-agency workgroup, pesticide general permit informal consultation progress, and potential paths forward for OW/OST in future consultations , including BE completion schedule for the next parameters . We will also cover Agency next steps in the iterative process of section 7 consultations at the national level. In this block, we expect to cover ideas regarding an agency-wide workgroup for responding to ESA requirements in a consistent fashion and putting together a technical point-of-contact list for each unit within the Agency. Updates regarding how Regions and States are handling current consultations, the outlook for those consultations, ways to share information, and potential issues will be shared.

2016-005625-R5--21

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

09/10/2010 11:40 AM

To Linda Holst, David Pfeifer

cc Candice Bauer, Milo Anderson

bcc

Subject Call with Ohio FWS

Candice asked me to send an email summary of our call with Jeromy Applegate this morning .

1) General Issues

Jeromy said that based on the position that FWS took in the cyanide BO , they will again not consider antidegradation for the same reason they have given us in the past - EPA did not consult with them. They are also interested in looking at effects on host fish , this was apparently also an issue with the cyanide BO.

Jeromy said that FWS has a GIS data layer for mussels , and he will look into getting clearance to send this layer to us so we can use this more precise information on the location of mussels in Ohio . This would be an improvement over the more coarse information they have provided us in the past - i.e. county-level and narrative descriptions of mussel waters .

2) IN bat/Scioto madtom BE (Scioto Basin Rule Package, submitted in August 2010)

Some good news - they will concur with our Indiana bat/Scioto madtom BE for the Scioto Basin. They will raise a few issues but nothing that would prevent them from concurring .

3) Eric's BE (submitted in Feb 2010)

It sounded as though they will be concurring on the not likelies for IN bat and some plants . For mussels , he said he would like to see us work into our ten-mile downstream rationale (i.e. "no effect" if mussel waters are a minimum of ten miles downstream from a segment with a use change) the differential effect of EWH versus WWH on downstream ammonia concentrations. He is looking for a "worst-case" scenario. This comment also bears relevance to the Scioto mussel BE .

4) Moving Forward

FWS will send us a concurrence letter on the bat and madtom by the end of next week. We agreed to send Jeromy a Word version of the February BE so he could insert comments ; this will give us better insight on how to address his concerns. Jeromy will get us comments by September 24th. He will also look into getting us the GIS layer for mussels . Candice (and myself perhaps) will work more on the downstream issue for ammonia. Once we have made progress on ammonia, we will turn out attention to Temperature, DO and pH. Jeromy would be open to reviewing informally what we have so far on all four parameters; we did not agree on whether to send him any of this material since they are still works in progress in our shop (and with HQ in the case of ammonia).

Candice, did I miss anything?

Pete

2016-005625-R5--22

David Pfeifer /R5/USEPA/US

09/10/2010 12:12 PM

To Peter Jackson

cc Candice Bauer, Linda Holst, Milo Anderson, Andrew
Tschampa

bcc

Subject Re: Call with Ohio FWS

Is this the BE Jeromy requested?



OhioBE12110.doc

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024

fax: 312-582-5164

e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

Peter Jackson

Candice asked me to send an email su...

09/10/2010 11:40:55 AM

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Milo Anderson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 09/10/2010 11:40 AM
Subject: Call with Ohio FWS

Candice asked me to send an email summary of our call with Jeromy Applegate this morning .

1) General Issues

Jeromy said that based on the position that FWS took in the cyanide BO , they will again not consider antidegradation for the same reason they have given us in the past - EPA did not consult with them. They are also interested in looking at effects on host fish , this was apparently also an issue with the cyanide BO.

Jeromy said that FWS has a GIS data layer for mussels, and he will look into getting clearance to send this layer to us so we can use this more precise information on the location of mussels in Ohio . This would be an improvement over the more coarse information they have provided us in the past - i.e. county-level and narrative descriptions of mussel waters .

2) IN bat/Scioto madtom BE (Scioto Basin Rule Package, submitted in August 2010)

Some good news - they will concur with our Indiana bat/Scioto madtom BE for the Scioto Basin. They will raise a few issues but nothing that would prevent them from concurring .

3) Eric's BE (submitted in Feb 2010)

It sounded as though they will be concurring on the not likelies for IN bat and some plants . For mussels, he said he would like to see us work into our ten-mile downstream rationale (i.e. "no effect" if mussel waters are a minimum of ten miles downstream from a segment with a use change) the differential effect of EWH versus WWH on downstream ammonia concentrations. He is looking for a "worst-case" scenario. This comment also bears relevance to the Scioto mussel BE .

4) Moving Forward

FWS will send us a concurrence letter on the bat and madtom by the end of next week. We agreed to send Jeromy a Word version of the February BE so he could insert comments; this will give us better insight on how to address his concerns. Jeromy will get us comments by September 24th. He will also look into getting us the GIS layer for mussels. Candice (and myself perhaps) will work more on the downstream issue for ammonia. Once we have made progress on ammonia, we will turn out attention to Temperature, DO and pH. Jeromy would be open to reviewing informally what we have so far on all four parameters; we did not agree on whether to send him any of this material since they are still works in progress in our shop (and with HQ in the case of ammonia).

Candice, did I miss anything?

Pete

2016-005625-R5--23

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

09/10/2010 01:20 PM

To David Pfeifer

cc Andrew Tschampa, Candice Bauer, Linda Holst, Milo Anderson

bcc

Subject Re: Call with Ohio FWS

It looks like it...Candice, can you confirm if this is the correct version of the BE ? I can send to Jeromy if it is.

Pete

David Pfeifer

[Is this the BE Jeromy requested? Davi...](#)

09/10/2010 12:12:47 PM

From: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Milo Anderson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Andrew Tschampa/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 09/10/2010 12:12 PM
Subject: Re: Call with Ohio FWS

Is this the BE Jeromy requested?

[attachment "OhioBE12110.doc" deleted by Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US]

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024
fax: 312-582-5164
e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

Peter Jackson

[Candice asked me to send an email su...](#)

09/10/2010 11:40:55 AM

2016-005625-R5--24

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
09/21/2010 09:45 AM

To Linda Holst
cc
bcc
Subject draft ESA Nat'l discussion outline

A) Status of cyanide

- 1- rejection of CN BO.
 - ACR determination; poor data sets as basis (2 of 3); not validated (upcoming publication); lack of translation to protectiveness
 - Not replicable with other chemicals; stakeholders/regions will likely be unable to follow the method (unnecessarily complex)
- 2- Use of Besser (Dwyer) method - eg, safety factor of 0.5 applied to CCC to protect untested listed species

B) Major issues currently

- 1- old criteria values and upcoming consultations
- 2- BE method
 - when should ICE be used; steps for use of ICE/decision tree
- 3- consulting where no AWQC exist (yet)
- 4- chloride and sulfate (due to upcoming criteria)

C) Other issues with repercussions on consultations

- 1- OGC: desert rock decision update? (OGC opinion/coverage)
- 2- NODA data: R's will need to review the data and look at existing species data for protectiveness (low issue)
- 3- Services requesting re-initiation and legal/reg requirements (get OGC opinion/speaker to cover this)
- 4- PGP: Currently in consultation/status
- 5- funding for next year: BE manual update?, what else? (Joe/Ephraim)

Regional Issues

- 1- R5/R7 - ammonia, DO, Temp, sulfate, chloride (Holst)
- 2- R3/Ches Bay office - programmatic consultation request (need rep: Cheryl?)
- 3- R6 - NM re-eval consultation request (need rep: Russel?)
- 4- other (will request this info from contacts)

My intent is to have a draft PPT prepared by early next week (pre-October) for review by yourself and Jennifer.

Wade

2016-005625-R5--25

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

09/21/2010 10:12 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: draft ESA Nat'l discussion outline

Wade's outline.

----- Forwarded by Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US on 09/21/2010 10:12 AM -----

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 09/21/2010 09:45 AM
Subject: draft ESA Nat'l discussion outline

A) Status of cyanide

- 1- rejection of CN BO.
 - ACR determination; poor data sets as basis (2 of 3); not validated (upcoming publication); lack of translation to protectiveness
 - Not replicable with other chemicals; stakeholders/regions will likely be unable to follow the method (unnecessarily complex)
- 2- Use of Besser (Dwyer) method - eg, safety factor of 0.5 applied to CCC to protect untested listed species

B) Major issues currently

- 1- old criteria values and upcoming consultations
- 2- BE method
 - when should ICE be used; steps for use of ICE/decision tree
- 3- consulting where no AWQC exist (yet)
- 4- chloride and sulfate (due to upcoming criteria)

C) Other issues with repercussions on consultations

- 1- OGC: desert rock decision update? (OGC opinion/coverage)
- 2- NODA data: R's will need to review the data and look at existing species data for protectiveness (low issue)
- 3- Services requesting re-initiation and legal/reg requirements (get OGC opinion/speaker to cover this)
- 4- PGP: Currently in consultation/status
- 5- funding for next year: BE manual update?, what else? (Joe/Ephraim)

Regional Issues

- 1- R5/R7 - ammonia, DO, Temp, sulfate, chloride (Holst)
- 2- R3/Ches Bay office - programmatic consultation request (need rep: Cheryl?)
- 3- R6 - NM re-eval consultation request (need rep: Russel?)
- 4- other (will request this info from contacts)

My intent is to have a draft PPT prepared by early next week (pre-October) for review by yourself and Jennifer.

Wade

2016-005625-R5--26

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
09/21/2010 11:33 AM

To "Meehan, Clair", Joe Beaman, Linda Holst,
"wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us"
cc
bcc
Subject RE: today's ESA planning discussion

Here is my proposed outline for discussion today . This is a first draft and is open to other considerations .

-Wade

A) Status of cyanide

- 1- rejection of CN BO.
 - ACR determination; poor data sets as basis (2 of 3); not validated (upcoming publication); lack of translation to protectiveness
 - Not replicable with other chemicals; stakeholders/regions will likely be unable to follow the method (unnecessarily complex)
- 2- Use of Besser (Dwyer) method - eg, safety factor of 0.5 applied to CCC to protect untested listed species

B) Major issues currently

- 1- old criteria values and upcoming consultations
- 2- BE method
 - when should ICE be used; steps for use of ICE/decision tree
- 3- consulting where no AWQC exist (yet)
- 4- chloride and sulfate (due to upcoming criteria)

C) Other issues with repercussions on consultations

- 1- OGC: desert rock decision update? (OGC opinion/coverage)
- 2- NODA data: R's will need to review the data and look at existing species data for protectiveness (low issue)
- 3- Services requesting re-initiation and legal/reg requirements (get OGC opinion/speaker to cover this)
- 4- PGP: Currently in consultation/status
- 5- funding for next year: BE manual update?, what else? (Joe/Ephraim)

Regional Issues

- 1- R5/R7 - ammonia, DO, Temp, sulfate, chloride (Holst)
- 2- R3/Ches Bay office - programmatic consultation request (need rep: Cheryl?)
- 3- R6 - NM re-eval consultation request (need rep: Russel?)
- 4- other (will request this info from contacts)

2016-005625-R5--27

**Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US**
09/22/2010 09:25 AM

To Linda Holst, wigal.jennifer
cc
bcc
Subject Re: WQSMA Fall Meeting: Preparing Your Session on ESA
Consultation

Edits to this are due on the 27th to Lee/Claire. I added #3. Please propose any edits so I can send them back to them on time. Thanks!

1:30–3:00 National ESA Consultation Issues

Wade Lehmann, Linda Holst, & Jennifer Wigal

Session will include discussions on: 1) defining a consistent approach to developing biological evaluations (BEs) and status on cyanide consultation; 2) understanding the goals of the new national

ESA workgroup and engaging the workgroup to obtain specific outcomes and 3) description of major issues faced by regions

Lee Harrigan

Hi Everyone, Here is the current draft o...

08/31/2010 03:39:19 PM

From: Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US
To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
wigal.jennifer@deq.state.or.us
Cc: Christina Christensen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Joe Beaman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA,
Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com
Date: 08/31/2010 03:39 PM
Subject: WQSMA Fall Meeting: Preparing Your Session on ESA Consultation

Hi Everyone,

Here is the current draft of the agenda for the WQSMA meeting in Yosemite. You have 90 minutes on Day 2 to discuss national ESA consultation issues.

[attachment "WQSMA Agenda Oct 2010 DRAFT 8-31-10.pdf" deleted by Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US]

DEADLINES

Final changes/revisions/updates to your session description due by Monday, September 27.

Any advance materials for participants also due by Monday **September 27**.

Packet materials, including PPT slides, due by Tuesday, October 7.

PLANNING MEETING

We like to have at least one teleconference between the session leads and the facilitator prior to the meeting.

It looks like you all may be free on Thursday September 16 for a meeting at 11:00 am or at 2:00 pm (eastern).

Let me know if you have a preference, or I will send you an invitation tomorrow to meet at the 2pm time slot.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Lee 566-1666

2016-005625-R5--28

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
09/28/2010 04:20 PM

To "Meehan, Clair"
cc Linda Holst, WIGAL Jennifer
bcc
Subject Re: WQSMA - ESA Session

Sorry! I thought I had already sent that to you. We added a 3):

Session will include discussions on: 1) defining a consistent approach to developing biological evaluations (BEs) and status on cyanide consultation; 2) understanding the goals of the new national ESA workgroup and engaging the workgroup to obtain specific outcomes and 3) description of major issues faced by regions

Wade Lehmann
Ecological Risk Assessment Branch
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science & Technology, Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (4304T)
Washington DC 20460
202.566.2022 (office) 202.566.1140 (fax)

-----"Meehan, Clair" <Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com> wrote: -----

To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, WIGAL Jennifer
<WIGAL.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us>
From: "Meehan, Clair" <Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com>
Date: 09/28/2010 02:52PM
Subject: WQSMA - ESA Session

Wade, Linda, Jennifer,

I'm checking in to see if you have any further updates on the blurb for the WQSMA agenda. The text is currently:

Session will include discussions on: 1) defining a consistent approach to developing biological evaluations (BEs); and 2) understanding the goals of the new national ESA workgroup and engaging the workgroup to obtain specific outcomes. The session will also include time for Regions to raise current issues related to ESA.

Would you like to add to this or change it? Please let me know by tomorrow COB so that we can update the agenda.

Thanks!

Clair

Clair Meehan | Environmental Scientist

Direct: 508.734.5513

clair.meehan@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech | Complex World, Clear Solutions

905 South Street | Walpole, MA 02081 | www.tetrattech.com

PLEASE NOTE: This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

2016-005625-R5--29

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
10/01/2010 05:24 PM

To Linda Holst
cc
bcc
Subject WQSMA rough draft1

Linda,

Here is the first draft of the WQSMA ESA presentation. I have left the regional section wide open, so if you have specific items you wish to cover, please add them. I have information on a few other regional efforts that I will speak to, although that will be fairly brief unless the attendees have more to add.

Please keep this EPA internal for the moment. I have been asked to get management (and potentially OGC) approval before sharing with Jennifer and others.

Joe has asked for any modifications so that we can share it with the division director by Wednesday of next week.

Sorry for the short timelines, I was planning on creating this next week and had to adjust my timing.

Wade

Wade Lehmann, PhD
Ecological Risk Assessment Branch
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science & Technology, Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (4304T)
Washington DC 20460



202.566.2022 (office) 202.566.1140 (fax)ESA WQSMA October 2010.pptx

2016-005625-R5--30

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

10/01/2010 05:31 PM

To David Pfeifer

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: WQSMA rough draft1

Your advice is welcome too if you have time to look at.
Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

From: Linda Holst

Sent: 10/01/2010 06:30 PM EDT

To: Candice Bauer

Subject: Fw: WQSMA rough draft1

I could really use your help in developing content for the R5 slides? What issues do you want me to present?
Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

From: Wade Lehmann

Sent: 10/01/2010 06:24 PM EDT

To: Linda Holst

Subject: WQSMA rough draft1

Linda,

Here is the first draft of the WQSMA ESA presentation. I have left the regional section wide open, so if you have specific items you wish to cover, please add them. I have information on a few other regional efforts that I will speak to, although that will be fairly brief unless the attendees have more to add.

Please keep this EPA internal for the moment. I have been asked to get management (and potentially OGC) approval before sharing with Jennifer and others.

Joe has asked for any modifications so that we can share it with the division director by Wednesday of next week.

Sorry for the short timelines, I was planning on creating this next week and had to adjust my timing.

Wade

Wade Lehmann, PhD

Ecological Risk Assessment Branch

Health and Ecological Criteria Division

Office of Science & Technology, Office of Water

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (4304T)

Washington DC 20460



202.566.2022 (office) 202.566.1140 (fax)ESA WQSMA October 2010.pptx

2016-005625-R5--31

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
10/06/2010 10:09 AM

To Linda Holst
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: WQSMA rough draft1

Linda,
Did you want to add to these slides or make comments on the content? They are due to printing tomorrow to the contractor, so please let me know. If you plan on using your own presentation (as you did in the spring) let me know and I'll move forward with these as well. They need to be trimmed down and cleaned up a little.

Thanks,
Wade

----- Forwarded by Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US on 10/06/2010 11:08 AM -----

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
To: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 10/01/2010 06:24 PM
Subject: WQSMA rough draft1

Linda,
Here is the first draft of the WQSMA ESA presentation. I have left the regional section wide open, so if you have specific items you wish to cover, please add them. I have information on a few other regional efforts that I will speak to, although that will be fairly brief unless the attendees have more to add.

Please keep this EPA internal for the moment. I have been asked to get management (and potentially OGC) approval before sharing with Jennifer and others.

Joe has asked for any modifications so that we can share it with the division director by Wednesday of next week.

Sorry for the short timelines, I was planning on creating this next week and had to adjust my timing.

Wade

Wade Lehmann, PhD
Ecological Risk Assessment Branch
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
Office of Science & Technology, Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (4304T)
Washington DC 20460



202.566.2022 (office) 202.566.1140 (fax) ESA WQSMA October 2010.pptx

2016-005625-R5--32

Wade
Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US
10/14/2010 10:06 AM

To Linda Holst
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Fw: WQSMA rough draft1

They have been revised and more completely detailed for notes. They are currently being reviewed by my division director. I am available if you wish to discuss anything specific, now that those slides are off of my plate temporarily. My next big project is to detail a response for you for ammonia.



Please do not share as they have not been Ok'd by management: ESA WQSMA October 2010 10-12-10.pptx

Wade

Linda Holst	Did you revise your slides? I'm not pro...	10/14/2010 10:56:27 AM
-------------	--	------------------------

From: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US
To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 10/14/2010 10:56 AM
Subject: Re: Fw: WQSMA rough draft1

Did you revise your slides? I'm not prodding...just wondering because Candice and I are discussing them today.

Wade Lehmann	Linda, Did you want to add to these sli...	10/06/2010 10:09:22 AM
--------------	--	------------------------

2016-005625-R5--33

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

10/14/2010 06:01 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Your thoughts on ESA commitments within Region 5 for FY11

Can you put whatever you want me to send to Beaman in a message and send it to me? Thanks.

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

Candice Bauer

----- Original Message -----

From: Candice Bauer

Sent: 10/14/2010 09:28 AM CDT

To: Linda Holst

Subject: Fw: Your thoughts on ESA commitments within Region 5 for FY11

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.

Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)

77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604

Office Phone: 312-353-2106

Fax: 312-697-2668

I am working on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday of each week

and will return any messages on my next work day.

----- Forwarded by Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US on 10/14/2010 09:28 AM -----

From: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US

To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 10/13/2010 12:25 PM

Subject: Re: Your thoughts on ESA commitments within Region 5 for FY11

Personally, I see ammonia as being fairly straightforward. We can offer assistance with the other parameters as they arise, although cyanide, chloride, sulfate are likely to be contentious and may require Office Director level discussions in order to prevent overlap with national consultation efforts.

I am gone next week for WQSMA, but should be available to help you with ammonia the following week. The draft ammonia document contains most of the information (plus the new SMAVs as recalculated) you will need for determinations.

Wade

Candice Bauer

Wade- We wanted to get your thoughts...

10/01/2010 04:15:26 PM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US

To: Wade Lehmann/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: holst.linda@epa.gov

Date: 10/01/2010 04:15 PM

Subject: Your thoughts on ESA commitments within Region 5 for FY11

Wade- We wanted to get your thoughts about what we are committing to our RA in terms of what we will get done in FY11 to resolve existing backlogs (in this case, ESA backlog). IF you can get us back any thoughts on this, we would appreciate it.

We are considering the following commitment with regard to resolving the outstanding non-concurrence on the Ohio designated use consultations.

How do we plan to resolve issue: Approval of uses affecting segments with listed mussels were backlogged because of the ongoing, unresolved consultation with USFWS on the protectiveness of the Ohio's and EPA's ammonia criteria to protect aquatic life. To resolve this backlog, EPA will need to complete the technical work to determine the mussel-protective criteria for ammonia, temperature, DO, pH, cyanide and chlorine, get USFWS to agree with that assessment, and either have Ohio EPA agree to adopt these criteria on a site-specific basis for waters with mussels, or promulgate them for Ohio waters with listed mussels.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
I am working on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday of each week
and will return any messages on my next work day.

2016-005625-R5--34

Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US

12/10/2010 09:42 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Re: OH FWS conversation - items I hope to discuss

I told Pete that you guys should cover the call.

Candice Bauer

Here is what I am thinking for topics I w...

12/10/2010 09:26:36 AM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: jackson.peter@epa.gov, holst.linda@epa.gov
Cc: pfeifer.david@epa.gov
Date: 12/10/2010 09:26 AM
Subject: OH FWS conversation - items I hope to discuss

Here is what I am thinking for topics I would like to cover ...

- 1-Scioto BE - concurrence on nonmussels, so we have the mussel issues remaining
- 2-Erics BE - preliminary comments but no concurrence on nonmussels (scioto madtom and in bat issues)
- 3- Robie's BE - upcoming analysis and comments to be submitted to OHEPA Dec 20

Left with mussels for both BEs and potentially new DU be???

Formal Mussel BE

1- Over summer, we worked on DU consultation issues including lit review for DO , temperature, pH, and chlorine and developed ICE models for mussels. ICE models are one piece of information that we will utilize in BE for ammonia and maybe cyanide and chlorine. We have also looked at their outputs for chloride and sulfate for other consultation. They are an improvement on the webICE module but still not as species or genus specific as we would like. We have a project in mind with USGS to conduct further testing to help us test and refine the ICE models but it is currently not funded.

2-Need to do mapping to identify affected NPDES permits and associated implementation issues

3-Will need brief HQ on findings of BE and identify listed mussel protective criteria and implementation issues like where they should apply

4- Inclination is to move forward with ammonia and then follow with other parameters in order to get moving on this.

5- Ammonia update- finalized criteria after snail testing is completed (underway or will be soon); include renormalized mussel data for pink mucket and some other species that brings PM SMAV up and criteria up a little. Will determine if mussel present/absent criteria is still viable.

Other

New Intern coming to help out....

Lots of GLRI funded mussel/amphibian projects are moving forward -- want to have webinar to update folks and allow for discussion of important mussel ecology and testing issues -- shooting for February.

Interest in hearing more about technical basis for ammonia criteria revision? maybe in Feb/March timeframe after snail stuff is done... or do you want to start earlier (with HQ go ahead)?

Will need to brief states also on criteria and potential ESA consultation issues associated with ammonia criteria in that timeframe too.

Next steps?

Comments on Robie's package (Dec. 20)

Resolve nonmussel DU change issues to get concurrence (Jan)

Mussel mapping/NPDES identification (Jan)

Brief EPA HQ on BE to get input on major issues/questions of Natl. sign. (Feb?)

Mussel study/ecology webinar (Feb)
Draft BE to FWS (Feb/March????)
Ammonia criteria webinar? (Feb/Mar)
Comments on Triennial (March)
Suggestions?????

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
I am working on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday of each week
and will return any messages on my next work day.

2016-005625-R5--35

David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US

04/18/2012 11:07 AM

To Danielle Salvaterra

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: ESA 2-pager-revised per Linda's comments

FYI

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024

fax: 312-582-5164

e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

----- Forwarded by David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US on 04/18/2012 11:07 AM -----

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/18/2012 10:52 AM
Subject: ESA 2-pager-revised per Linda's comments

Jori-

Please use this revised version of the 2 page paper on ESA.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668

I am working on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday of each week



and will return any messages on my next work day. ESA2012review_2-pager041812.docx

2016-005625-R5--36

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

04/24/2012 01:08 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Scioto BE

Here it is! Take a look when you get a chance. I have worked on it up to the Cumulative Effects section, so don't read anything beyond that except for Appendix II (10-mile rationale), which I spent some time trying to shore up some in response to Jeromy's comments. (Eric had worked on it and I did some more.)

I got the three new listed mussels in there. Mostly read through the analysis section and see what you think of the arguments therein, and whether you think it is strong enough for not likelies...

Thanks!

Pete



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE 03-14-12.doc

2016-005625-R5--37

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To David Pfeifer, Linda Holst

05/02/2012 09:10 AM

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Fw: Edits to the ESA Draft 2-Pager for the R5 Review

[REDACTED]

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
I am working on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday of each week
and will return any messages on my next work day.

-----David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
From: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US
Date: 05/01/2012 03:57PM
Cc: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Re: Fw: Edits to the ESA Draft 2-Pager for the R5 Review

I asked Candice to look at the proposed edits. We will meet your deadline.

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024
fax: 312-582-5164
e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

Jori Taylor---05/01/2012 03:41:20 PM---Please get me an edited document ASAP but NLT Thursday, 2 p.m. Thanks!

From: Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US
To: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 05/01/2012 03:41 PM
Subject: Fw: Edits to the ESA Draft 2-Pager for the R5 Review

Please get me an edited document ASAP but NLT Thursday, 2 p.m.

Thanks!

----- Forwarded by Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US on 05/01/2012 03:40 PM -----

From: Danielle Salvaterra/DC/USEPA/US
To: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Janita Aguirre/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Corey Buffo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Elizabeth Skane/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 05/01/2012 03:38 PM
Subject: Edits to the ESA Draft 2-Pager for the R5 Review

Hi Dave,

Based on Janita's review of the draft 2-pager, we would like to request a few edits be made to the ESA 2-paper before it is finalized for the R5 Review:

[attachment "ESA2012review_2-pager041812_5.1.12.docx" deleted by Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US]

Please contact me with any questions/concerns.

Thanks!

Danielle

Danielle Salvaterra
U.S. EPA, Office of Water
Office of Science & Technology
Standards & Health Protection Division
Regional, State, & Tribal Standards Support Branch
MC 4305T

T: 202-564-1631
F: 202-566-9981

2016-005625-R5--38

David Pfeifer /R5/USEPA/US

05/02/2012 10:05 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Fw: Edits to the ESA Draft 2-Pager for the R5 Review

I accepted HQ's edits and made a few of my own to attempt to reflect the points in your e-mail. Is this OK?



ESA2012review_2-pager041812_5.2.12 -dp.docx

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024
fax: 312-582-5164
e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

Candice Bauer

I am fine with their edits, but this is not t...

05/02/2012 09:10:52 AM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 05/02/2012 09:10 AM
Subject: Re: Fw: Edits to the ESA Draft 2-Pager for the R5 Review

[REDACTED]

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106

Fax: 312-697-2668

I am working on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday of each week and will return any messages on my next work day.

-----David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

From: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US

Date: 05/01/2012 03:57PM

Cc: Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject: Re: Fw: Edits to the ESA Draft 2-Pager for the R5 Review

I asked Candice to look at the proposed edits. We will meet your deadline.

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024

fax: 312-582-5164

e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

Jori Taylor---05/01/2012 03:41:20 PM---Please get me an edited document ASAP but NLT Thursday, 2 p.m. Thanks!

From: Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US

To: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 05/01/2012 03:41 PM

Subject: Fw: Edits to the ESA Draft 2-Pager for the R5 Review

Please get me an edited document ASAP but NLT Thursday, 2 p.m.

Thanks!

----- Forwarded by Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US on 05/01/2012 03:40 PM -----

From: Danielle Salvaterra/DC/USEPA/US

To: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Janita Aguirre/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Corey Buffo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Elizabeth Skane/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 05/01/2012 03:38 PM

Subject: Edits to the ESA Draft 2-Pager for the R5 Review

Hi Dave,

Based on Janita's review of the draft 2-pager, we would like to request a few edits be made to the ESA 2-pager before it is finalized for the R5 Review:

[attachment "ESA2012review_2-pager041812_5.1.12.docx" deleted by Jori Taylor/R5/USEPA/US]

Please contact me with any questions/concerns.

Thanks!
Danielle

Danielle Salvaterra
U.S. EPA, Office of Water
Office of Science & Technology
Standards & Health Protection Division
Regional, State, & Tribal Standards Support Branch
MC 4305T

T: 202-564-1631
F: 202-566-9981

2016-005625-R5--39

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

05/03/2012 03:37 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Revised Scioto BE

Hey Candice, I put the average temp data in here in the sub-lethal temp section. Use this draft for your review.....save it over the other one I sent, it has the same file name.

Pete



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE 03-14-12.doc

2016-005625-R5--40

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Peter Jackson

06/19/2012 05:25 PM

cc

bcc

Subject Scioto Basin BE review

Here are some thoughts. I was having a hard time seeing comments so I had to put comments in the text in brackets. I think we should chat about the data we have and see if there is some refinement to some of the analysis/conclusions for a few things (glochidia temp data, brooding female DO data, metals/pH interaction data). But, I think the majority of what needs to be here is here! Hooray!



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE crb.doc

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.

Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)

77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604

Office Phone: 312-353-2106

Fax: 312-697-2668

I am working on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday of each week and will return any messages on my next work day.

2016-005625-R5--41

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

07/31/2012 12:39 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Cyanide

Candice, I looked at the Eric BE and aside from listing the criteria there is no further mention of cyanide .
(Recall that we held aside the segments within 10 miles of mussel waters and thus did not act on them.) If
you can contact anyone that may have relevant data that would be great. I will look in a few other places.

Pete

2016-005625-R5--42

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

07/31/2012 12:55 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Found One Paper on Cyanide

Here is one from Pandolfo and Cope that I put in a request for:

[Environ Toxicol Chem.](#) 2012 Aug;31(8):1801-6. doi: 10.1002/etc.1876. Epub 2012 Jun 15.

Acute effects of road salts and associated cyanide compounds on the early life stages of the unionid mussel *Villosa iris*.

[Pandolfo TJ](#), [Cope WG](#), [Young GB](#), [Jones JW](#), [Hua D](#), [Lingenfelter SF](#).

Source

North Carolina Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Department of Biology, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA. tjpandol@ncsu.edu.

Abstract

The toxicity of cyanide to the early life stages of freshwater mussels (order Unionida) has remained unexplored. Cyanide is known to be acutely toxic to other aquatic organisms. Cyanide-containing compounds, such as sodium ferrocyanide and ferric ferrocyanide, are commonly added to road deicing salts as anticaking agents. The purpose of the present study was to assess the acute toxicity of three cyanide compounds (sodium cyanide, sodium ferrocyanide, and ferric ferrocyanide), two road salts containing cyanide anticaking agents (Morton and Cargill brands), a brine deicing solution (Liquidow brand), and a reference salt (sodium chloride) on glochidia (larvae) and juveniles of the freshwater mussel *Villosa iris*. Sodium ferrocyanide and ferric ferrocyanide were not acutely toxic to glochidia and juvenile mussels at concentrations up to 1,000 mg/L and 100 mg/L, respectively. Lowest observed effect concentrations (LOECs) for these two chemicals ranged from 10 to >1,000 mg/L. Sodium cyanide was acutely toxic to juvenile mussels, with a 96-h median effective concentration (EC50) of 1.10 mg/L, although glochidia tolerated concentrations up to 10 mg/L. The EC50s for sodium chloride, Liquidow brine, Morton road salt, and Cargill road salt were not significantly different for tests within the same life stage and test duration (range, 1.66-4.92 g/L). These results indicate that cyanide-containing anticaking agents do not exacerbate the toxicity of road salts, but that the use of road salts and brine solutions for deicing or dust control on roads may warrant further investigation. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 2012; 31: 1801-1806. © 2012 SETAC.

Copyright © 2012 SETAC.

2016-005625-R5--43

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

07/31/2012 01:37 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Another (Non-Peer Reviewed) Cyanide Paper

Haven't read this one yet...a 2006 review of the 1985 EPA recommended criteria of 22 and 5.2 mg/l for cyanide (acute and chronic), concludes that these are pretty much on the mark. I would note that Ohio's CWH criteria are set at the EPA recommended criteria (with the other designations being set at roughly two times the EPA criteria). Pete

<http://www.environmental-expert.com/Files/5306/articles/13790/451.pdf>

2016-005625-R5--44

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

07/31/2012 01:47 PM

To David Pfeifer

cc

bcc

Subject Cyanide

Dave, is there anywhere that I can go to see what WQC EPA is currently working on and also the status of those? I am specifically interested in cyanide. Are you aware of any work to update the 85 recommended WQC for cyanide?

Thanks, Pete

2016-005625-R5--45

David Pfeifer /R5/USEPA/US

07/31/2012 04:27 PM

To Peter Jackson

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Cyanide

I am not aware of any work underway on cyanide. I suggest checking in with Candice; she is pretty up to speed on hq ALC work.

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024
fax: 312-582-5164
e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

Peter Jackson

Dave, is there anywhere that I can go t...

07/31/2012 01:47:48 PM

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US
To: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 07/31/2012 01:47 PM
Subject: Cyanide

Dave, is there anywhere that I can go to see what WQC EPA is currently working on and also the status of those? I am specifically interested in cyanide. Are you aware of any work to update the 85 recommended WQC for cyanide?

Thanks, Pete

2016-005625-R5--46

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

07/31/2012 04:38 PM

To David Pfeifer

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Cyanide

Thanks!

David Pfeifer

I am not aware of any work underway o...

07/31/2012 04:27:12 PM

From: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 07/31/2012 04:27 PM
Subject: Re: Cyanide

I am not aware of any work underway on cyanide. I suggest checking in with Candice; she is pretty up to speed on hq ALC work.

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024
fax: 312-582-5164
e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

Peter Jackson

Dave, is there anywhere that I can go t...

07/31/2012 01:47:48 PM

2016-005625-R5--47

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

08/01/2012 07:41 AM

To Chris.Skalski

cc

bcc

Subject Cyanide

Hey Chris,

How goes it? I am wondering if you can steer me to the history of when cyanide was approved as a WQC in Ohio? Is there a document that supports the current WQC for cyanide that you can point me to on the Ohio EPA website? I just noticed that the cyanide WQC for CWH is different than for WWH and EWH and I am trying to work on some of the ESA evaluations that we have stacked up from the past several use designation packages.

Thanks for any information, Pete Jackson

2016-005625-R5--48

"Skalski, Chris"
<Chris.Skalski@epa.state.oh.
us>

08/01/2012 02:35 PM

To: Peter Jackson
cc
bcc
Subject: RE: Cyanide

Hi Pete,

Well I'm usually quite busy since Bob Heitzman's departure. Speaking of which, I could use his help in tracking down the approval letter for the rulemaking that would have included the cyanide aquatic life criterion. I did find the letter from our AG at the time to your regional administrator at the time, which is attached. That should help you in terms of the history.

I've also attached the criteria support document for cyanide.

Which use designation packages are you working on that are still outstanding?

Chris

From: Peter Jackson [mailto:Jackson.Peter@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 8:41 AM
To: Skalski, Chris
Subject: Cyanide

Hey Chris,

How goes it? I am wondering if you can steer me to the history of when cyanide was approved as a WQC in Ohio? Is there a document that supports the current WQC for cyanide that you can point me to on the Ohio EPA website? I just noticed that the cyanide WQC for CWH is different than for WWH and EWH and I am trying to work on some of the ESA evaluations that we have stacked up from the past several use designation packages.



Thanks for any information, Pete Jackson Cyanide.pdf AG_Letter_1990.pdf

2016-005625-R5--49

**Pamela
Vierheller/CI/USEPA/US**

08/01/2012 02:43 PM

To Peter Jackson

cc

bcc

Subject requested articles

Dear Patron,

Material you requested through InterLibrary Loan is attached to this email . Feel free to contact me with any questions.



Bringolf.pdf Pandolfo.pdf

Please note that this material may be protected by copyright law , Title 17 U.S. Code.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=n4Slb8dq2D3fqQrD3701wg_3d_3d

Pamela Vierheller
InterLibrary Loan
AWBERC Library (OCLC: ELB)
(Contracted by ASRC)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
26 W. Martin Luther King Drive
Cincinnati, Ohio 45268
(513) 569-7936
(513) 569-7709 fax

2016-005625-R5--50

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

08/01/2012 02:57 PM

To "Skalski, Chris"

cc

bcc

Subject RE: Cyanide

Thanks Chris. Believe it or not, this package is the Scioto package from 2007! The mussels and ammonia have been hanging it up, so I am trying to get everything else done on that and then will do the same for at least two other packages that came after that one. Ammonia is still awaiting EPA issuance of the review recommended criteria for ammonia. We're trying to get FWS to work outside the box with us, but we at EPA have been attending to other priorities of late, and I am trying to get us back on this stuff. The lag is not a good thing!

Pete

"Skalski, Chris"

Hi Pete, Well I'm usually quite busy sin...

08/01/2012 02:35:11 PM

From: "Skalski, Chris" <Chris.Skalski@epa.state.oh.us>
To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 08/01/2012 02:35 PM
Subject: RE: Cyanide

Hi Pete,

Well I'm usually quite busy since Bob Heitzman's departure. Speaking of which, I could use his help in tracking down the approval letter for the rulemaking that would have included the cyanide aquatic life criterion. I did find the letter from our AG at the time to your regional administrator at the time, which is attached. That should help you in terms of the history.

I've also attached the criteria support document for cyanide.

Which use designation packages are you working on that are still outstanding?

Chris

From: Peter Jackson [mailto:Jackson.Peter@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 8:41 AM
To: Skalski, Chris
Subject: Cyanide

Hey Chris,

How goes it? I am wondering if you can steer me to the history of when cyanide was approved as a WQC in Ohio? Is there a document that supports the current WQC for cyanide that you can point me to on the Ohio EPA website? I just noticed that the cyanide WQC for CWH is different than for WWH and EWH and

I am trying to work on some of the ESA evaluations that we have stacked up from the past several use designation packages.

Thanks for any information, Pete Jackson[attachment "Cyanide.pdf" deleted by Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US] [attachment "AG_Letter_1990.pdf" deleted by Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US]

2016-005625-R5--51

Lareina
Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US
08/13/2012 11:50 AM

To Candice Bauer
cc
bcc
Subject deferral to national consultation

Hi Candice

[REDACTED]

Lareina Guenzel
Water Quality Unit
U.S. EPA Region 8
ph (303) 312-6610
fx (303) 312-7206

Candice Bauer

[Let me knwo if you want to talk through...](#)

08/08/2012 12:54:15 PM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Lareina Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 08/08/2012 12:54 PM
Subject:

Let me knwo if you want to talk through the ESA consultation issue... ie, whether deferral to national consultation is an option (if standards are equal to or more stringent than national number). I can share our experience... I guess I never really asked that question before, but maybe I should have.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

2016-005625-R5--52

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Lareina Guenzel

08/13/2012 12:26 PM

cc

bcc

Subject Re: deferral to national consultation

Sorry I meant to get back to you.. So, thanks for reminder.

We have really only been doing consultations on criteria where there are no 304a criteria (sulfate, BETX) or where our states criteria is different than the 304a criteria (initiated chloride criteria for IN where they adopted Iowa criteria value, WI nutrient criteria, WI thermal criteria). We also have been doing consultations on variances (again, different than 304a criteria).

Usually, we approve the 304a criteria and then defer 304a criteria to the national consultation with some support for doing so in a 7d memo [REDACTED]

That being said, we are also trying to resolve consultations on aquatic life uses in Ohio where the state has made changes to AL use that affects ammonia, DO (different than 304a for some uses), temp. (different than 304a), pH (different than 304a in some uses), and cyanide criteria (different than 304a in some uses); however, we are not yet close to resolving the ongoing consultation (we said not likely to adversely affect and FWS nonconcurrent). [REDACTED]

Give me a call if you want to chat some more!

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.

Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)

77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604

Office Phone: 312-353-2106

Fax: 312-697-2668

Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lareina Guenzel

[Hi Candice I left you a voice mail last...](#)

08/13/2012 11:50:33 AM

From: Lareina Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 08/13/2012 11:50 AM
Subject: deferral to national consultation

Hi Candice

I left you a voice mail last week, but I have just a couple general questions that I can send via email. Is your Region still deferring to the national consultation in action letters? A couple years ago R8 ORD asked us to stop deferring to the national consultation and suggested that we use a more general deferral language. They see it as legal vulnerability thing since national consultation is not going so well. Given this advise, we have been considering all of our actions on 304(a) criteria to be part of our backlog. If these actions are not part of our backlog, then our list is significantly shorter. Have you initiated consultation on any 304(a) criteria? I would expect that at least some Regions have, but maybe I am wrong.

Lareina Guenzel
Water Quality Unit
U.S. EPA Region 8
ph (303) 312-6610
fx (303) 312-7206

Candice Bauer

Let me knwo if you want to talk through...

08/08/2012 12:54:15 PM

2016-005625-R5--53

Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US

08/14/2012 03:57 PM

To Lee Harrigan

cc Alfred Basile, Amy Shields, Andrew Tschampa, Angela Chung, Angela Vincent, Ann Jacobs, Ann Lavaty, Anna Cornelious, Annie Godfrey, Barbara Mazur, Betsy Behl, Bob Angelo, Brian Thompson, Bryan Goodwin, Cheryl Atkinson, Christina Christensen, Christopher Hunter, Clair.Meehan, Claudia Fabiano, Colleen Flaherty, Corey Buffo, Dana Thomas, Danielle Anderson, Danielle Fuligni, Danielle Stephan, Dave Moon, David Pfeifer, Denise Hakowski, Diane Evans, Ed Decker, Edward Hammer, Elizabeth Doyle, Ellen Weitzler, Eric Monschein, Erica Fleisig, Eve Zimmerman, Evelyn Washington, Felix Locicero, Fred Leutner, Fritz Wagener, Gary Russo, Gary Welker, George Parrish, Grace Robiou, Gregory Stapleton, Gretchen Giannelli, Heather Goss, Heidi Nalven, Holiday Wirick, Holly Green, Ifeyinwa Davis, Izabela Wojtenko, James Curtin, Jane Watson, Janet Hashimoto, Janita Aguirre, Jennifer Brundage, Jill Nogi, Joanne Benante, Joe Beaman, Joe Piotrowski, Joel Hansel, John Delashmit, John Goodin, John Reyna, Karen Hamilton, Kathleen Collins, Kathleen Mayo, Kathryn Gallagher, Keith Hayden, kmcallister, Lareina Guenzel, Larinda Tervelt, Larry Merrill, Lars Wilcut, Laura Kwong, Lauren Petter, Lee Schroer, Linda Holst, Lisa-Perras Gordon, Lisa Huff, Lisa Larimer, Luis Cruz, Luke Cole, Lydia Mayo, Maja Tritt, Manjali Vican, Marcus Zobrist, Mario Sengco, Marjorie Wellman, Mark Barath, Mary Reiley, Matt Hubner, Matthew Mitchell, Matthew Szelag, Melinda McCoy, Melissa McCoy, Michael Beringer, Michelle Josilo, Michelle Schutz, mnelson, Peggy Donnelly, Peter Ford, Peter Jackson, Philip Crocker, Philip Woods, Renee Bellew, Robie Anson, Rosaura Conde, Rose Galer, Russell Nelson, Ruth Chemerys, Samantha Fontenelle, Sandra Spence, Sara Hilbrich, Sara Hisel-McCoy, Shari Barash, Sharon Frey, Stephen Maurano, Stephen Silva, Terrence Fleming, Thomas Gardner, Thomas Poleck, Tina Laidlaw, Tom Laverty, Tonya Fish, Tracy Bone, Trish Rider, Vera Williams-Bower, Wayne Jackson, William Beckwith

bcc

Subject Re: WQS Coordinators: Your Input Requested for Human Health Criteria Calculator

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] ... 08/14/2012 01:42:01 PM

From:

Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US

To:

Alfred Basile/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Amy Shields/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Andrew Tschampa/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Angela Chung/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Angela Vincent/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Jacobs/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Lavaty/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Anna Cornelious/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Annie Godfrey/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Barbara Mazur/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Betsy Behl/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Angelo/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Brian Thompson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Bryan Goodwin/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Cheryl Atkinson/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Christina Christensen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Claudia Fabiano/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Colleen Flaherty/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Corey Buffo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dana Thomas/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Danielle Fuligni/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Danielle Stephan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dave Moon/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Denise Hakowski/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Ed

Decker/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Edward Hammer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Elizabeth Doyle/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ellen Weitzler/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Eric Monschein/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Erica Fleisig/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Eve Zimmerman/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Evelyn Washington/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Felix Locicero/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Fred Leutner/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Fritz Wagener/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Russo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Welker/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, George Parrish/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Grace Robiou/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Gregory Stapleton/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Gretchen Giannelli/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Heather Goss/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Heidi Nalven/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Holiday Wirick/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Holly Green/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ifeyinwa Davis/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Izabela Wojtenko/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, James Curtin/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jane Watson/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Janet Hashimoto/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Janita Aguirre/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jennifer Brundage/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jill Nogi/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Joanne Benante/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Joe Beaman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Joe Piotrowski/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Joel Hansel/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, John Delashmit/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, John Goodin/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, John Reyna/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, kmcallister@horsleywitten.com, Karen Hamilton/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Kathleen Mayo/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Kathryn Gallagher/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Keith Hayden/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Lareina Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Larinda Tervelt/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Larry Merrill/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Lars Wilcut/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Laura Kwong/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lauren Petter/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lee Schroer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa-Perras Gordon/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa Huff/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa Larimer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Luke Cole/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lydia Mayo/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, mnelson@horsleywitten.com, Maja Tritt/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Manjali Vican/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Marcus Zobrist/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Mario Sengco/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Marjorie Wellman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Barath/R3/USEPA/US, Mary Reiley/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Matt Hubner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew Mitchell/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew Szelag/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Melinda McCoy/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Melissa McCoy/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Michael Beringer/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Michelle Josilo/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Michelle Schutz/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Peggy Donnelly/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Peter Ford/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Crocker/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Woods/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Renee Bellew/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Robie Anson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Rosaura Conde/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rose Galer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Russell Nelson/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Ruth Chemerys/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Samantha Fontenelle/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Sandra Spence/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Sara Hilbrich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Sara Hisel-McCoy/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Shari Barash/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Sharon Frey/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephen Maurano/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephen Silva/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Terrence Fleming/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Thomas Gardner/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Thomas Poleck/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Tina Laidlaw/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Tom Lavery/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Tonya Fish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Tracy Bone/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Trish Rider/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Vera Williams-Bower/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Wayne Jackson/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, William Beckwith/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Christopher Hunter/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Kathleen Collins/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Danielle Anderson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Clair.Meehan@tetrattech.com, Luis Cruz/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc:

Date:

08/14/2012 01:42 PM

Subject:

WQS Coordinators: Your Input Requested for Human Health Criteria Calculator

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thanks,
Lee
202-566-1666



Human Health Criteria Calculator 6.9.10 JH.xlsx

2016-005625-R5--54

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

08/15/2012 10:00 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Scioto BE

As forewarned, here it is! For whenever you get a chance to look it over. Note that the table/figure/appendix numbering have not been checked since I re-opened the document to work on it. A few maps need replacing, I have asked Milo to work on them but have not seen anything yet. I also have not done anything on the cumulative effects section and the Section VI conclusion may be redundant with some stuff I put in just ahead of that. Basically, I did not do anything beyond where it says "STOP HERE". But the main analysis has been beefed up with the addition of cyanide and a few other things intended to be responsive to some of your earlier comments. This is a good time for you to look it over and see how close you think it is and where more work may be needed.

In the meantime I will work on cumulative effects, the conclusion section, formatting, table numbering, references etc. when I get back. Thanks!

Pete



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE crb.doc

2016-005625-R5--55

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

09/05/2012 09:38 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Scioto BE

Candice, here it is. I forgot to update the file name so it has the same name as the old draft.

Pete



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE crb.doc

2016-005625-R5--56

Lisa Macchio /R10/USEPA/US

09/17/2012 12:53 PM

To OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

cc

bcc

Subject ESA 7(d) question - really quick

[REDACTED]

2016-005625-R5--57

Diane Evans /R6/USEPA/US

09/17/2012 12:55 PM

To Lisa Macchio

cc Amy Shields, Ann Jacobs, Ann Lavaty, Annie Godfrey, Barbara Mazur, Brian Thompson, Cheryl Atkinson, Dave Moon, David Pfeifer, Denise Hakowski, Dru Keenan, Ed Decker, Edward Hammer, Ellen Weitzler, Eve Zimmerman, Fritz Wagener, Gary Welker, George Parrish, Holiday Wirick, Izabela Wojtenko, Janet Hashimoto, Joel Hansel, John Reyna, Kathleen Mayo, Lareina Guenzel, Larry Merrill, Lauren Petter, Lee Harrigan, Lisa-Perras Gordon, Lisa Macchio, Lydia Mayo, Mark Barath, Matthew Mitchell, Matthew Szelag, Melinda McCoy, Peggy Donnelly, Philip Woods, Renee Bellew, Robie Anson, Russell Nelson, Suesan Saucerman, Terrence Fleming, Thomas Poleck, Tina Laidlaw, Tonya Fish, Vera Williams-Bower, Wayne Jackson, William Beckwith, Candice Bauer, Rose Galer, Tracy Bone, Stephen Maurano, Jill Nogi, Larinda Tervelt, Peter Jackson, Matt Hubner, Diane Evans, Bob Angelo, Angela Vincent, Maja Tritt, Claudia Fabiano, Anna Cornelious

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

I still am....

Lisa Macchio

How many of you are approving wqs an...

09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/17/2012 12:53 PM
Subject: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

[REDACTED]

2016-005625-R5--58

Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US

09/17/2012 12:57 PM

To Diane Evans

cc Amy Shields, Ann Jacobs, Ann Lavaty, Annie Godfrey, Barbara Mazur, Brian Thompson, Cheryl Atkinson, Dave Moon, David Pfeifer, Denise Hakowski, Dru Keenan, Ed Decker, Edward Hammer, Ellen Weitzler, Eve Zimmerman, Fritz Wagener, Gary Welker, George Parrish, Holiday Wirick, Izabela Wojtenko, Janet Hashimoto, Joel Hansel, John Reyna, Kathleen Mayo, Lareina Guenzel, Larry Merrill, Lauren Petter, Lee Harrigan, Lisa-Perras Gordon, Lydia Mayo, Mark Barath, Matthew Mitchell, Matthew Szlag, Melinda McCoy, Peggy Donnelly, Philip Woods, Renee Bellew, Robie Anson, Russell Nelson, Suesan Saucerman, Terrence Fleming, Thomas Poleck, Tina Laidlaw, Tonya Fish, Vera Williams-Bower, Wayne Jackson, William Beckwith, Candice Bauer, Rose Galer, Tracy Bone, Stephen Maurano, Jill Nogi, Larinda Tervelt, Peter Jackson, Matt Hubner, Bob Angelo, Angela Vincent, Maja Tritt, Claudia Fabiano, Anna Cornelious

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

thanks.

Diane Evans

I still am.... From: Lisa Macchio/R10/U...

09/17/2012 10:55:34 AM

From:

Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/US

To:

Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

Cc:

Amy Shields/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Jacobs/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Lavaty/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Annie Godfrey/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Barbara Mazur/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Brian Thompson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Cheryl Atkinson/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dave Moon/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Denise Hakowski/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dru Keenan/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Ed Decker/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Edward Hammer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Ellen Weitzler/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Eve Zimmerman/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Fritz Wagener/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Welker/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, George Parrish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Holiday Wirick/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Izabela Wojtenko/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Janet Hashimoto/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Joel Hansel/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, John Reyna/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Kathleen Mayo/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Lareina Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Larry Merrill/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Lauren Petter/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa-Perras Gordon/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Lydia Mayo/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Barath/R3/USEPA/US, Matthew Mitchell/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew Szlag/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Melinda McCoy/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Peggy Donnelly/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Woods/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Renee Bellew/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Robie Anson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Russell Nelson/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Suesan Saucerman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Terrence Fleming/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Thomas Poleck/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Tina Laidlaw/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Tonya Fish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Vera Williams-Bower/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Wayne Jackson/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, William Beckwith/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Rose Galer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Tracy Bone/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephen Maurano/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Jill Nogi/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Larinda Tervelt/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Matt Hubner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Angelo/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Angela Vincent/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Maja Tritt/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Claudia Fabiano/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Anna Cornelious/R4/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

09/17/2012 10:55 AM

Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

I still am....

Lisa Macchio

How many of you are approving wqs an...

09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--59

Suesan
Saucerman/R9/USEPA/US
09/17/2012 01:29 PM

To Lisa Macchio

cc Diane Evans, Amy Shields, Ann Jacobs, Ann Lavaty, Annie Godfrey, Barbara Mazur, Brian Thompson, Cheryl Atkinson, Dave Moon, David Pfeifer, Denise Hakowski, Dru Keenan, Ed Decker, Edward Hammer, Ellen Weitzler, Eve Zimmerman, Fritz Wagener, Gary Welker, George Parrish, Holiday Wirick, Izabela Wojtenko, Janet Hashimoto, Joel Hansel, John Reyna, Kathleen Mayo, Lareina Guenzel, Larry Merrill, Lauren Petter, Lee Harrigan, Lisa-Perras Gordon, Lydia Mayo, Mark Barath, Matthew Mitchell, Matthew Szelag, Melinda McCoy, Peggy Donnelly, Philip Woods, Renee Bellew, Robie Anson, Russell Nelson, Terrence Fleming, Thomas Poleck, Tina Laidlaw, Tonya Fish, Vera Williams-Bower, Wayne Jackson, William Beckwith, Candice Bauer, Rose Galer, Tracy Bone, Stephen Maurano, Jill Nogi, Larinda Tervelt, Peter Jackson, Matt Hubner, Bob Angelo, Angela Vincent, Maja Tritt, Claudia Fabiano, Anna Cornelious, Diane Fleck

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

We still are.



United States Environmental Protection Agency

Suesan Saucerman
U.S. EPA Region 9, WTR-2
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: (415)-972-3522



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

Lisa Macchio

thanks. From: Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/U

09/17/2012 10:57:20 AM

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Amy Shields/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Jacobs/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Lavaty/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Annie Godfrey/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Barbara Mazur/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Brian Thompson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Cheryl Atkinson/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dave Moon/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Denise Hakowski/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dru Keenan/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Ed Decker/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Edward Hammer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Ellen Weitzler/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Eve Zimmerman/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Fritz Wagener/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Welker/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, George Parrish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Holiday Wirick/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Izabela Wojtenko/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Janet Hashimoto/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Joel Hansel/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, John Reyna/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Kathleen Mayo/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Lareina Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Larry Merrill/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Lauren Petter/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa-Perras Gordon/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lydia Mayo/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Barath/R3/USEPA/US, Matthew Mitchell/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew Szelag/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Melinda McCoy/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Peggy Donnelly/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Woods/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Renee Bellew/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Robie Anson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Russell Nelson/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Suesan Saucerman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Terrence Fleming/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Thomas

Poleck/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Tina Laidlaw/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Tonya Fish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Vera Williams-Bower/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Wayne Jackson/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, William Beckwith/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Rose Galer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Tracy Bone/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephen Maurano/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Jill Nogi/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Larinda Tervelt/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Matt Hubner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Angelo/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Angela Vincent/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Maja Tritt/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Claudia Fabiano/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Anna Cornelious/R4/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

09/17/2012 10:57 AM

Subject:

Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

thanks.

Diane Evans	I still am.... From: Lisa Macchio/R10/U...	09/17/2012 10:55:34 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--60

Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US

09/17/2012 01:33 PM

To Suesan Saucerman

cc Diane Evans, Amy Shields, Ann Jacobs, Ann Lavaty, Annie Godfrey, Barbara Mazur, Brian Thompson, Cheryl Atkinson, Dave Moon, David Pfeifer, Denise Hakowski, Dru Keenan, Ed Decker, Edward Hammer, Ellen Weitzler, Eve Zimmerman, Fritz Wagener, Gary Welker, George Parrish, Holiday Wirick, Izabela Wojtenko, Janet Hashimoto, Joel Hansel, John Reyna, Kathleen Mayo, Lareina Guenzel, Larry Merrill, Lauren Petter, Lee Harrigan, Lisa-Perras Gordon, Lydia Mayo, Mark Barath, Matthew Mitchell, Matthew Szlag, Melinda McCoy, Peggy Donnelly, Philip Woods, Renee Bellew, Robie Anson, Russell Nelson, Terrence Fleming, Thomas Poleck, Tina Laidlaw, Tonya Fish, Vera Williams-Bower, Wayne Jackson, William Beckwith, Candice Bauer, Rose Galer, Tracy Bone, Stephen Maurano, Jill Nogi, Larinda Tervelt, Peter Jackson, Matt Hubner, Bob Angelo, Angela Vincent, Maja Tritt, Claudia Fabiano, Anna Cornelious, Diane Fleck

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

thanks

Suesan Saucerman

[We still are.](#)

Suesan Saucerman

09/17/2012 11:30:28 AM

From: Suesan Saucerman/R9/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Amy Shields/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Jacobs/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Lavaty/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Annie Godfrey/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Barbara Mazur/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Brian Thompson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Cheryl Atkinson/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dave Moon/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Denise Hakowski/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dru Keenan/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Ed Decker/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Edward Hammer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Ellen Weitzler/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Eve Zimmerman/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Fritz Wagener/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Welker/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, George Parrish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Holiday Wirick/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Izabela Wojtenko/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Janet Hashimoto/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Joel Hansel/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, John Reyna/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Kathleen Mayo/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Lareina Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Larry Merrill/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Lauren Petter/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa-Perras Gordon/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lydia Mayo/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Barath/R3/USEPA/US, Matthew Mitchell/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew Szlag/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Melinda McCoy/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Peggy Donnelly/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Woods/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Renee Bellew/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Robie Anson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Russell Nelson/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Terrence Fleming/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Thomas Poleck/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Tina Laidlaw/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Tonya Fish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Vera Williams-Bower/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Wayne Jackson/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, William Beckwith/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Rose Galer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Tracy Bone/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephen Maurano/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Jill Nogi/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Larinda Tervelt/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Matt Hubner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Angelo/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Angela Vincent/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Maja Tritt/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Claudia Fabiano/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Anna Cornelious/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Diane Fleck/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 09/17/2012 11:30 AM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

We still are.



United States Environmental Protection Agency

Suesan Saucerman
U.S. EPA Region 9, WTR-2
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: (415)-972-3522



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

Lisa Macchio	thanks. From: Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/U	09/17/2012 10:57:20 AM
Diane Evans	I still am.... From: Lisa Macchio/R10/U...	09/17/2012 10:55:34 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--61

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

To Candice Bauer

09/17/2012 02:01 PM

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Candice, I was going to reply saying "We still are", but It has been a while so I have forgotten all of the parameters for which we usually defer. Aren't we trying to work through some of the parameters that we could be deferring on? I know we're holding off on ammonia, but aside from that, we could be deferring on some of the parameters right? If so, should we tell folks what we are up to?

Pete

----- Forwarded by Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US on 09/17/2012 01:45 PM -----

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: Suesan Saucerman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Amy Shields/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Jacobs/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Lavaty/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Annie Godfrey/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Barbara Mazur/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Brian Thompson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Cheryl Atkinson/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dave Moon/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Denise Hakowski/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dru Keenan/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Ed Decker/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Edward Hammer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Ellen Weitzler/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Eve Zimmerman/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Fritz Wagener/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Welker/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, George Parrish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Holiday Wirick/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Izabela Wojtenko/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Janet Hashimoto/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Joel Hansel/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, John Reyna/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Kathleen Mayo/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Lareina Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Larry Merrill/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Lauren Petter/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa-Perras Gordon/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lydia Mayo/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Barath/R3/USEPA/US, Matthew Mitchell/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew Szelag/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Melinda McCoy/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Peggy Donnelly/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Woods/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Renee Bellew/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Robie Anson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Russell Nelson/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Terrence Fleming/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Thomas Poleck/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Tina Laidlaw/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Tonya Fish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Vera Williams-Bower/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Wayne Jackson/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, William Beckwith/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Rose Galer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Tracy Bone/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephen Maurano/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Jill Nogi/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Larinda Tervelt/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Matt Hubner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Angelo/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Angela Vincent/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Maja Tritt/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Claudia Fabiano/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Anna Cornelious/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Diane Fleck/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 09/17/2012 01:33 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

thanks

Suesan Saucerman

[We still are.](#)

[Suesan Saucermar](#)

09/17/2012 11:30:28 AM

From: Suesan Saucerman/R9/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Amy Shields/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Jacobs/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Lavaty/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Annie

Godfrey/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Barbara Mazur/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Brian Thompson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Cheryl Atkinson/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dave Moon/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Denise Hakowski/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Dru Keenan/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Ed Decker/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Edward Hammer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Ellen Weitzler/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Eve Zimmerman/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Fritz Wagener/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Welker/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, George Parrish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Holiday Wirick/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Izabela Wojtenko/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Janet Hashimoto/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Joel Hansel/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, John Reyna/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Kathleen Mayo/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Lareina Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Larry Merrill/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Lauren Petter/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lee Harrigan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lisa-Perras Gordon/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Lydia Mayo/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Barath/R3/USEPA/US, Matthew Mitchell/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Matthew Szelag/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Melinda McCoy/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Peggy Donnelly/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Philip Woods/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Renee Bellew/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Robie Anson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Russell Nelson/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Terrence Fleming/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Thomas Poleck/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Tina Laidlaw/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Tonya Fish/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Vera Williams-Bower/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Wayne Jackson/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, William Beckwith/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Rose Galer/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Tracy Bone/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephen Maurano/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Jill Nogi/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Larinda Tervelt/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Matt Hubner/R6/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Angelo/R7/USEPA/US@EPA, Angela Vincent/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Maja Tritt/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Claudia Fabiano/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Anna Cornelious/R4/USEPA/US@EPA, Diane Fleck/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 09/17/2012 11:30 AM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

We still are.



United States Environmental Protection Agency

Suesan Saucerman
U.S. EPA Region 9, WTR-2
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: (415)-972-3522



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

Lisa Macchio	thanks. From: Diane Evans/R6/USEPA/U	09/17/2012 10:57:20 AM
Diane Evans	I still am.... From: Lisa Macchio/R10/U...	09/17/2012 10:55:34 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--62

Lareina
Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US
09/17/2012 02:20 PM

To Lisa Macchio
cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
bcc
Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Hi Lisa

[REDACTED]

Lareina Guenzel
Water Quality Unit
U.S. EPA Region 8
ph (303) 312-6610
fx (303) 312-7206

Lisa Macchio

How many of you are approving wqs an...

09/17/2012 11:53:57 AM

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/17/2012 11:53 AM
Subject: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

[REDACTED]

2016-005625-R5--63

Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US

09/17/2012 02:25 PM

To Lareina Guenzel

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

thanks

Lareina Guenzel

[Hi Lisa A couple years ago we also st...](#)

09/17/2012 12:20:36 PM

From: Lareina Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/17/2012 12:20 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Hi Lisa

A couple years ago we also stopped "deferring the national consultation" in our action letters for similar reasons but we do mention the national consultation in our internal 7(d) memos to file.

Lareina Guenzel
Water Quality Unit
U.S. EPA Region 8
ph (303) 312-6610
fx (303) 312-7206

Lisa Macchio

[How many of you are approving wqs an...](#)

09/17/2012 11:53:57 AM

2016-005625-R5--64

Janet
Hashimoto/R9/USEPA/US
09/17/2012 02:39 PM

To Lisa Macchio
cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
bcc
Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Standard practice in R9 to include language about deferring to national consultation. jh



United States Environmental Protection Agency

Janet Y. Hashimoto
Manager, Standards and TMDL Office
US EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street (WTR-2)
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-972-3452; 415-947-3537 (fax)

Lisa Macchio

How many of you are approving wqs an...

09/17/2012 10:53:58 AM

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/17/2012 10:53 AM
Subject: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

[REDACTED]

2016-005625-R5--65

Wayne
Jackson/R2/USEPA/US
09/18/2012 06:36 AM

To Lisa Macchio

cc Amy Shields, Ann Jacobs, Ann Lavaty, Annie Godfrey, Barbara Mazur, Brian Thompson, Cheryl Atkinson, Dave Moon, David Pfeifer, Denise Hakowski, Dru Keenan, Ed Decker, Edward Hammer, Ellen Weitzler, Eve Zimmerman, Shelly Norland, Fritz Wagener, Gary Welker, George Parrish, Holiday Wirick, Izabela Wojtenko, Janet Hashimoto, Joel Hansel, John Reyna, Kathleen Mayo, Lareina Guenzel, Larry Merrill, Lauren Petter, Lee Harrigan, Lisa-Perras Gordon, Lisa Macchio, Lydia Mayo, Mark Barath, Matthew Mitchell, Matthew Szelag, Melinda McCoy, Peggy Donnelly, Philip Woods, Renee Bellew, Robie Anson, Russell Nelson, Suesan Saucerman, Terrence Fleming, Thomas Poleck, Tina Laidlaw, Tonya Fish, Vera Williams-Bower, Wayne Jackson, William Beckwith, Candice Bauer, Rose Galer, Tracy Bone, Stephen Maurano, Jill Nogi, Larinda Tervelt, Peter Jackson, Matt Hubner, Diane Evans, Anna Sofranko, Bob Angelo, Angela Vincent, Maja Tritt, Claudia Fabiano, Anna Cornelious

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Hi Lisa,

We have continued to use this approach in Region 2. As a matter of fact in support of the proposal to remove NJ and PR from the NTR earlier this year, we wrote 2 ESA memos to the file which included this language which was included as boiler plate language by HQ (see attached).

Thanks,

Wayne



ESA Withdrawal Memo.NJ.doc ESA Withdrawal Memo.PR.doc

Lisa Macchio

How many of you are approving wqs an...

09/17/2012 01:53:57 PM

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/17/2012 01:53 PM
Subject: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

[REDACTED]

2016-005625-R5--66

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Lisa Macchio

09/19/2012 11:05 AM

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

We are trying to complete regional consultations where the adopted criteria depart from our EPA guidance (e.g., nutrients, thermal), where the criteria are less stringent than our national criteria (e.g., chloride criteria, variances), or where there are no national criteria (e.g., sulfate). In other cases where the criteria is clearly equal to or more stringent than the national criteria, we are deferring to the national consultation using either the standard language others shared or a simplified rationale similar to that of the standard language.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio

[How many of you are approving wqs an...](#)

09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators,
Date: 09/17/2012 12:53 PM
Subject: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

[REDACTED]

2016-005625-R5--67

Ann Lavaty/R7/USEPA/US

09/19/2012 12:57 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc Lisa Macchio, OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

What Candice has described is exactly what we do in R7.

Ann Lavaty
Environmental Scientist
USEPA Region 7
901 N. 5th St.
Kansas City, KS 66101
(913) 551-7370

NOTE: The EPA Regional Office will be moving from Kansas City , Kansas, to Lenexa, Kansas, in early October 2012. After October 15, please use the following mailing address for the Regional Office :

EPA Region 7
11201 Renner Blvd.
Lenexa, KS 66219

Telephone numbers and email addresses for all EPA Region 7 employees will remain the same.

Candice Bauer

[We are trying to complete regional con...](#)

09/19/2012 11:05:51 AM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 11:05 AM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

We are trying to complete regional consultations where the adopted criteria depart from our EPA guidance (e.g., nutrients, thermal), where the criteria are less stringent than our national criteria (e.g., chloride criteria, variances), or where there are no national criteria (e.g., sulfate). In other cases where the criteria is clearly equal to or more stringent than the national criteria , we are deferring to the national consultation using either the standard language others shared or a simplified rationale similar to that of the standard language.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio

[How many of you are approving wqs an...](#)

09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--68

Ellen Weitzler /R1/USEPA/US

09/19/2012 01:22 PM

To Lisa Macchio

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Region 1 has not been qualifying our approvals in that way .

Ellen Weitzler, P.E.
Water Quality Standards Coordinator
US EPA Region 1
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100 (OEP06-2)
Boston, MA 02109-3912
Tel 617-918-1582
FAX 617-918-0582

Lisa Macchio

[How many of you are approving wqs an...](#)

09/17/2012 01:53:58 PM

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/17/2012 01:53 PM
Subject: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

[REDACTED]

2016-005625-R5--69

Lisa Macchio /R10/USEPA/US

09/19/2012 01:31 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Can I get a copy of the simplified rationale and the standard language?

Candice Bauer

[We are trying to complete regional con...](#)

09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 09:05 AM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

We are trying to complete regional consultations where the adopted criteria depart from our EPA guidance (e.g., nutrients, thermal), where the criteria are less stringent than our national criteria (e.g., chloride criteria, variances), or where there are no national criteria (e.g., sulfate). In other cases where the criteria is clearly equal to or more stringent than the national criteria, we are deferring to the national consultation using either the standard language others shared or a simplified rationale similar to that of the standard language.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio

[How many of you are approving wqs an...](#)

09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--70

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Lisa Macchio

09/19/2012 02:12 PM

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

In 2005, we included this language in a memo to the file on ESA determinations for Indiana's triennial review:

USEPA has initiated consultation on its national Section 304(a) criteria recommendations. USEPA is deferring consultation on USEPA's approval of certain elements of Indiana's revised water quality standards to the ongoing national Section 304(a) consultation. These are USEPA's approval of Indiana's revision to express its cyanide criteria in terms of free cyanide and Indiana's revision to express its metals criteria in terms of dissolved metals. Both of these revisions are consistent with USEPA's recommendations regarding establishing criteria based on the bioavailable form of these pollutants. In neither case will the revision change the intended level of protection of the criteria. USEPA Region 5 and USFWS Region 3 will determine, after conclusion of the national consultation, whether any further consultation is needed at the regional level in regards to the action described above. This sequence will ensure that regional consultations benefit from the comprehensive consideration of scientific information undertaken nationally.

In 2008, we deferred consultation on IL's DO criteria to the national consultation. Here is the memo to file regarding that action.



Final IL DO MOA.pdf

I believe those are the two most recent examples of deferring consultation to the national consultation. More recently, (1) we have had a lot of variances where we have to consult, (2) we have had lots of criteria that do not have national recommendations and so we are doing regional consultations, or (3) we have been able to say that the action will have no effect (i.e., due to presence of only terrestrial species in action area). We do also have a variety of example memos regarding consultation where we are not finishing the regional consultation prior to approval of state/tribal standards (this is what I generally think of when I hear the term 7(d) since we mostly have dealt with this situation recently). In the 7(d) memos where we have initiated, but not yet completed, regional consultation, we explain that our action does not violate section 7(d) with regards to irretrievable spending of significant resources and/or potential for adverse impacts while the regional consultation is being completed. The two examples below show the range of information in a 7(d) memo from very detailed (in the case of WI thermal standards) and very succinct (variances).



Memo to File Section 7d.pdf



Marinette ESA Memo variance.pdf

I hope this helps.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
--------------	--	------------------------

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 01:31 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Can I get a copy of the simplified rationale and the standard language?

Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--71

Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US

09/19/2012 02:16 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Thanks Candice. It looks like when you do in fact write a memo to the record (for example the variance approval) on the 7(d) approach you have at least initiated consultation and prepared a draft BE. Is that correct?

Candice Bauer

[In 2005, we included this language in a...](#)

09/19/2012 12:12:28 PM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 12:12 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

In 2005, we included this language in a memo to the file on ESA determinations for Indiana's triennial review:

USEPA has initiated consultation on its national Section 304(a) criteria recommendations. USEPA is deferring consultation on USEPA's approval of certain elements of Indiana's revised water quality standards to the ongoing national Section 304(a) consultation. These are USEPA's approval of Indiana's revision to express its cyanide criteria in terms of free cyanide and Indiana's revision to express its metals criteria in terms of dissolved metals. Both of these revisions are consistent with USEPA's recommendations regarding establishing criteria based on the bioavailable form of these pollutants. In neither case will the revision change the intended level of protection of the criteria. USEPA Region 5 and USFWS Region 3 will determine, after conclusion of the national consultation, whether any further consultation is needed at the regional level in regards to the action described above. This sequence will ensure that regional consultations benefit from the comprehensive consideration of scientific information undertaken nationally.

In 2008, we deferred consultation on IL's DO criteria to the national consultation. Here is the memo to file regarding that action.
[attachment "Final IL DO MOA.pdf" deleted by Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US]

I believe those are the two most recent examples of deferring consultation to the national consultation. More recently, (1) we have had a lot of variances where we have to consult, (2) we have had lots of criteria that do not have national recommendations and so we are doing regional consultations, or (3) we have been able to say that the action will have no effect (i.e., due to presence of only terrestrial species in action area). We do also have a variety of example memos regarding consultation where we are not finishing the regional consultation prior to approval of state/tribal standards (this is what I generally think of when I hear the term 7(d) since we mostly have dealt with this situation recently). In the 7(d) memos where we have initiated, but not yet completed, regional consultation, we explain that our action does not violate section 7(d) with regards to irretrievable spending of significant resources and/or potential for adverse impacts while the regional consultation is being completed. The two examples below show the range of information in a 7(d) memo from very detailed (in the case of WI thermal standards) and very succinct (variances).

[attachment "Memo to File Section 7d.pdf" deleted by Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US]

[attachment "Marinette ESA Memo variance.pdf" deleted by Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US]

I hope this helps.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--72

Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US

09/19/2012 02:21 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Okay, I've now looked at the 7(d) memo for approving Wisconsin's thermal standards. It looks like for the temperature approval you did not prepare a draft BE, but did the analysis of impacts in the 7(d) memo itself? Or is there another document that lays out that same analysis you have in the 7(d) memo? Thanks for your help

Candice Bauer

[In 2005, we included this language in a...](#)

09/19/2012 12:12:28 PM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 12:12 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

In 2005, we included this language in a memo to the file on ESA determinations for Indiana's triennial review:

USEPA has initiated consultation on its national Section 304(a) criteria recommendations. USEPA is deferring consultation on USEPA's approval of certain elements of Indiana's revised water quality standards to the ongoing national Section 304(a) consultation. These are USEPA's approval of Indiana's revision to express its cyanide criteria in terms of free cyanide and Indiana's revision to express its metals criteria in terms of dissolved metals. Both of these revisions are consistent with USEPA's recommendations regarding establishing criteria based on the bioavailable form of these pollutants. In neither case will the revision change the intended level of protection of the criteria. USEPA Region 5 and USFWS Region 3 will determine, after conclusion of the national consultation, whether any further consultation is needed at the regional level in regards to the action described above. This sequence will ensure that regional consultations benefit from the comprehensive consideration of scientific information undertaken nationally.

In 2008, we deferred consultation on IL's DO criteria to the national consultation. Here is the memo to file regarding that action.
[attachment "Final IL DO MOA.pdf" deleted by Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US]

I believe those are the two most recent examples of deferring consultation to the national consultation. More recently, (1) we have had a lot of variances where we have to consult, (2) we have had lots of criteria that do not have national recommendations and so we are doing regional consultations, or (3) we have been able to say that the action will have no effect (i.e., due to presence of only terrestrial species in action area). We do also have a variety of example memos regarding consultation where we are not finishing the regional consultation prior to approval of state/tribal standards (this is what I generally think of when I hear the term 7(d) since we mostly have dealt with this situation recently). In the 7(d) memos where we have initiated, but not yet completed, regional consultation, we explain that our action does not violate section 7(d) with regards to irretrievable spending of significant resources and/or potential for adverse impacts while the regional consultation is being completed. The two examples below show the range of information in a 7(d) memo from very detailed (in the case of WI thermal standards) and very succinct (variances).

[attachment "Memo to File Section 7d.pdf" deleted by Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US]

[attachment "Marinette ESA Memo variance.pdf" deleted by Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US]

I hope this helps.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--73

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

09/19/2012 02:28 PM

To Lisa Macchio

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Yes. We do write a memo in that case.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio

Thanks Candice. It looks like when yo...

09/19/2012 02:16:25 PM

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 02:16 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Thanks Candice. It looks like when you do in fact write a memo to the record (for example the variance approval) on the 7(d) approach you have at least initiated consultation and prepared a draft BE. Is that correct?

Candice Bauer	In 2005, we included this language in a...	09/19/2012 12:12:28 PM
Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--74

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Lisa Macchio

09/19/2012 02:56 PM

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

The more complete answer would be that we try to end up in situation where we can:

(1) Approve the standards and document in the record of decision that EPA had determined that the action will have no effect on listed species due to the fact that there are no aquatic or aquatic-dependent species in the action area, such that no consultation is necessary, and (most of the time) notify FWS of our determination.

(2) Approve the standards and document that the action does not need consultation (Human health criteria, antidegradation provision, recreational uses or criteria) supported by rationale in our decision document and (most of the time) notify FWS of our determination or

(3) Approve criteria subject to completion of consultation by deferring to the national consultation (if criteria is equivalent to our national number), and notify FWS of our approval subject to completion of consultation, and show that the deferral is consistent with section 7(d) via a memo to the file.

When we cannot do that:

(1) Approve the standards after completing consultation (happens sometimes), such that no 7(d) memo is needed.

(2) Approve the criteria subject to completion of consultation. At the time of the approval, we notify FWS of the approval and request their concurrence on our BE (which we send with the approval letter), while documenting to the file that we do not believe that our approval violates section 7(d).

(3) Approve the criteria subject to completion of consultation. But, what sometimes happens (as in Wisconsin) is that we need to get the approval done and don't have time to write a BE prior to the approval. In that case, we will approve the action subject to completion of ESA consultation and send FWS the approval with a consultation initiation letter (i.e., here are the species we think are in action area, and request their response) and include some sort of justification in the file that we do not believe the action violates section 7(d). In the case of Wisconsin, we were worried about potential impacts because of the proximity of aquatic species to dischargers of heat so we tried to be very comprehensive in our documentation to support the statement in the record regarding no "impacts of concern".

I am working over the next couple months on an SOP for our Region and templates of decision docs/letters, etc. If you are interested, I can forward these materials when they get finalized.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.

Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)

77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604

Office Phone: 312-353-2106

Fax: 312-697-2668

Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio

Okay, I've now looked at the 7(d) mem...

09/19/2012 02:21:16 PM

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 02:21 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Okay, I've now looked at the 7(d) memo for approving Wisconsin's thermal standards. It looks like for the

temperature approval you did not prepare a draft BE, but did the analysis of impacts in the 7(d) memo itself? Or is there another document that lays out that same analysis you have in the 7(d) memo?
Thanks for you help

Candice Bauer	In 2005, we included this language in a...	09/19/2012 12:12:28 PM
Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--75

Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US

09/19/2012 03:01 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

This is absolutely terrific!!! Thanks for your detailed explanation. I think this is really going to help my manager as well as some new staff better understand the variety of approaches there are to this quagmire.

Candice Bauer

The more complete answer would be th...

09/19/2012 12:56:16 PM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 12:56 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

The more complete answer would be that we try to end up in situation where we can:

(1) Approve the standards and document in the record of decision that EPA had determined that the action will have no effect on listed species due to the fact that there are no aquatic or aquatic-dependent species in the action area, such that no consultation is necessary, and (most of the time) notify FWS of our determination.

(2) Approve the standards and document that the action does not need consultation (Human health criteria, antidegradation provision, recreational uses or criteria) supported by rationale in our decision document and (most of the time) notify FWS of our determination or

(3) Approve criteria subject to completion of consultation by deferring to the national consultation (if criteria is equivalent to our national number), and notify FWS of our approval subject to completion of consultation, and show that the deferral is consistent with section 7(d) via a memo to the file.

When we cannot do that:

(1) Approve the standards after completing consultation (happens sometimes), such that no 7(d) memo is needed.

(2) Approve the criteria subject to completion of consultation. At the time of the approval, we notify FWS of the approval and request their concurrence on our BE (which we send with the approval letter), while documenting to the file that we do not believe that our approval violates section 7(d).

(3) Approve the criteria subject to completion of consultation. But, what sometimes happens (as in Wisconsin) is that we need to get the approval done and don't have time to write a BE prior to the approval. In that case, we will approve the action subject to completion of ESA consultation and send FWS the approval with a consultation initiation letter (i.e., here are the species we think are in action area, and request their response) and include some sort of justification in the file that we do not believe the action violates section 7(d). In the case of Wisconsin, we were worried about potential impacts because of the proximity of aquatic species to dischargers of heat so we tried to be very comprehensive in our documentation to support the statement in the record regarding no "impacts of concern".

I am working over the next couple months on an SOP for our Region and templates of decision docs/letters, etc. If you are interested, I can forward these materials when they get finalized.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668

Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio	Okay, I've now looked at the 7(d) mem...	09/19/2012 02:21:16 PM
Candice Bauer	In 2005, we included this language in a...	09/19/2012 12:12:28 PM
Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--76

David Pfeifer /R5/USEPA/US

09/19/2012 03:08 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Nice work.

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024

fax: 312-582-5164

e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

----- Forwarded by David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US on 09/19/2012 03:08 PM -----

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 03:01 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

This is absolutely terrific!!! Thanks for your detailed explanation. I think this is really going to help my manager as well as some new staff better understand the variety of approaches there are to this quagmire.

Candice Bauer

The more complete answer would be th...

09/19/2012 12:56:16 PM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 12:56 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

The more complete answer would be that we try to end up in situation where we can:

(1) Approve the standards and document in the record of decision that EPA had determined that the action will have no effect on listed species due to the fact that there are no aquatic or aquatic-dependent species in the action area, such that no consultation is necessary, and (most of the time) notify FWS of our determination.

(2) Approve the standards and document that the action does not need consultation (Human health criteria, antidegradation provision, recreational uses or criteria) supported by rationale in our decision document and (most of the time) notify FWS of our determination or

(3) Approve criteria subject to completion of consultation by deferring to the national consultation (if criteria is equivalent to our national number), and notify FWS of our approval subject to completion of consultation, and show that the deferral is consistent with section 7(d) via a memo to the file.

When we cannot do that:

(1) Approve the standards after completing consultation (happens sometimes), such that no 7(d) memo is needed.

(2) Approve the criteria subject to completion of consultation. At the time of the approval, we notify FWS of the approval and request their concurrence on our BE (which we send with the approval letter), while documenting to the file that we do not believe that our approval violates section 7(d).

(3) Approve the criteria subject to completion of consultation. But, what sometimes happens (as in

Wisconsin) is that we need to get the approval done and don't have time to write a BE prior to the approval. In that case, we will approve the action subject to completion of ESA consultation and send FWS the approval with a consultation initiation letter (i.e., here are the species we think are in action area, and request their response) and include some sort of justification in the file that we do not believe the action violates section 7(d). In the case of Wisconsin, we were worried about potential impacts because of the proximity of aquatic species to dischargers of heat so we tried to be very comprehensive in our documentation to support the statement in the record regarding no "impacts of concern".

I am working over the next couple months on an SOP for our Region and templates of decision docs/letters, etc. If you are interested, I can forward these materials when they get finalized.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio	Okay, I've now looked at the 7(d) mem...	09/19/2012 02:21:16 PM
Candice Bauer	In 2005, we included this language in a...	09/19/2012 12:12:28 PM
Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--77

Lareina
Guenzel/R8/USEPA/US
09/19/2012 03:10 PM

To Lisa Macchio
cc Candice Bauer
bcc
Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

I agree. Very useful explanation.

Lareina Guenzel
Water Quality Unit
U.S. EPA Region 8
ph (303) 312-6610
fx (303) 312-7206

Lisa Macchio	This is absolutely terrific!!! Thanks for...	09/19/2012 02:01:33 PM
--------------	--	------------------------

From: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 02:01 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

This is absolutely terrific!!! Thanks for you detailed explanation. I think this is really going to help my manager as well as some new staff better understand the variety of approaches there are to this quagmire.

Candice Bauer	The more complete answer would be th...	09/19/2012 12:56:16 PM
Lisa Macchio	Okay, I've now looked at the 7(d) mem...	09/19/2012 02:21:16 PM
Candice Bauer	In 2005, we included this language in a...	09/19/2012 12:12:28 PM
Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--78

Larinda Tervelt /R4/USEPA/US

To Candice Bauer

09/21/2012 07:00 AM

cc

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Candice,

I would very much appreciate seeing your SOP and templates of decision documents , letters, etc. when you finalize them. It seems a very confusing process to me.

Larinda

Larinda Tervelt
Water Protection Division
Water Quality Standards Section
US EPA, Region 4
404-562-9448
Tervelt.Larinda@epa.gov

Candice Bauer

The more complete answer would be th...

09/19/2012 03:56:16 PM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Lisa Macchio/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: OW-OST-WQS-Coordinators
Date: 09/19/2012 03:56 PM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

The more complete answer would be that we try to end up in situation where we can:

(1) Approve the standards and document in the record of decision that EPA had determined that the action will have no effect on listed species due to the fact that there are no aquatic or aquatic-dependent species in the action area, such that no consultation is necessary, and (most of the time) notify FWS of our determination.

(2) Approve the standards and document that the action does not need consultation (Human health criteria, antidegradation provision, recreational uses or criteria) supported by rationale in our decision document and (most of the time) notify FWS of our determination or

(3) Approve criteria subject to completion of consultation by deferring to the national consultation (if criteria is equivalent to our national number), and notify FWS of our approval subject to completion of consultation, and show that the deferral is consistent with section 7(d) via a memo to the file.

When we cannot do that:

(1) Approve the standards after completing consultation (happens sometimes), such that no 7(d) memo is needed.

(2) Approve the criteria subject to completion of consultation. At the time of the approval, we notify FWS of the approval and request their concurrence on our BE (which we send with the approval letter), while documenting to the file that we do not believe that our approval violates section 7(d).

(3) Approve the criteria subject to completion of consultation. But, what sometimes happens (as in Wisconsin) is that we need to get the approval done and don't have time to write a BE prior to the approval. In that case, we will approve the action subject to completion of ESA consultation and send FWS the approval with a consultation initiation letter (i.e., here are the species we think are in action area, and request their response) and include some sort of justification in the file that we do not believe the action violates section 7(d). In the case of Wisconsin, we were worried about potential impacts because of the proximity of aquatic species to dischargers of heat so we tried to be very comprehensive in our documentation to support the statement in the record regarding no "impacts of concern".

I am working over the next couple months on an SOP for our Region and templates of decision docs/letters, etc. If you are interested, I can forward these materials when they get finalized.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Lisa Macchio	Okay, I've now looked at the 7(d) mem...	09/19/2012 02:21:16 PM
Candice Bauer	In 2005, we included this language in a...	09/19/2012 12:12:28 PM
Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--79

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Larinda Tervelt

09/21/2012 08:29 AM

cc

bcc

Subject Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

No problem.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Larinda Tervelt

Candice, I would very much appreciate...

09/21/2012 07:01:10 AM

From: Larinda Tervelt/R4/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 09/21/2012 07:01 AM
Subject: Re: ESA 7(d) question - really quick

Candice,
I would very much appreciate seeing your SOP and templates of decision documents , letters, etc. when you finalize them. It seems a very confusing process to me.
Larinda

Larinda Tervelt
Water Protection Division
Water Quality Standards Section
US EPA, Region 4
404-562-9448
Tervelt.Larinda@epa.gov

Candice Bauer	The more complete answer would be th...	09/19/2012 03:56:16 PM
Lisa Macchio	Okay, I've now looked at the 7(d) mem...	09/19/2012 02:21:16 PM
Candice Bauer	In 2005, we included this language in a...	09/19/2012 12:12:28 PM
Lisa Macchio	Can I get a copy of the simplified ration...	09/19/2012 01:31:12 PM
Candice Bauer	We are trying to complete regional con...	09/19/2012 09:05:52 AM
Lisa Macchio	How many of you are approving wqs an...	09/17/2012 12:53:58 PM

2016-005625-R5--80

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Peter Jackson

cc

09/24/2012 11:35 AM

bcc

Subject Scioto BE with additional comments/questions



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE crb91212.doc

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.

Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)

77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604

Office Phone: 312-353-2106

Fax: 312-697-2668

Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

2016-005625-R5--81

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

09/26/2012 03:40 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Cyanide BE/BO

Candice, who can I check in with at HQ re the above?

Pete

2016-005625-R5--82

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

10/01/2012 08:35 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Scioto BE - Coming at You Once Again!

Candice, attached are two drafts, one with my comments in reply to your comments (has "crb" in title - this will generally answer questions and indicate how I responded in the BE etc.), and one (title includes "October") with the actual changes made. I kept your edited document separate as I had made further changes since sending you this version and did not want to risk losing some of those changes.

Unless I get antsy I will probably wait for you to review the changes and let me know what you think. Hopefully, it is still somewhat fresh and you can focus on the changes based on your previous comments. Also, you did not get through the whole thing, so the rest awaits you!

Wouldn't it be something if we finished?!

I just thought of my Halloween costume - *Scioto BE writer*! Now THAT would be scary!

Pete



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE October 2012.doc



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE crb91212.doc

2016-005625-R5--83

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

11/26/2012 03:29 PM

To Janet Pellegrini

cc Patrick Kuefler, Sreedevi Yedavalli, David Pfeifer

bcc

Subject Re: draft permit - American Energy

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thanks, Pete

Sreedevi Yedavalli	Pete, Thank you for reviewing the p...	11/19/2012 02:04:32 PM
--------------------	--	------------------------

From: Sreedevi Yedavalli/R5/USEPA/US
To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: Patrick Kuefler/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Janet Pellegrini/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 11/19/2012 02:04 PM
Subject: Re: draft permit - American Energy

Pete,

[REDACTED]

Thank you,
Sreedevi

Peter Jackson	Sreedevi, Did you say Janet is the lead...	11/19/2012 12:55:18 PM
---------------	--	------------------------

Sreedevi Yedavalli	Pete, Attached is the draft of the A...	11/14/2012 02:58:50 PM
--------------------	---	------------------------

2016-005625-R5--84

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

11/27/2012 10:19 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Scioto BE Summary

Candice, I put together the attached summary of the Scioto BE. When you get a chance, please take a look at it and let me know if this gives you a comfort level with moving ahead with the BE . Also, do you think I should share this with Nicole or just wait and send her the final BE to review ?

Thanks, Pete



Summary of Scioto BE.docx

2016-005625-R5--85

Janet
Pellegrini/R5/USEPA/US
11/29/2012 05:03 PM

To Peter Jackson
cc Patrick Kuefler, Sreedevi Yedavalli, David Pfeifer
bcc
Subject Re: draft permit - American Energy

Pete,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

thanks again,
Janet

Peter Jackson

Janet, here are my comments on the A...

11/26/2012 03:29:56 PM

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US
To: Janet Pellegrini/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: Patrick Kuefler/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Sreedevi Yedavalli/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, David
Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 11/26/2012 03:29 PM
Subject: Re: draft permit - American Energy

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

2016-005625-R5--86

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

11/30/2012 08:21 AM

To Janet Pellegrini

cc David Pfeifer, Patrick Kuefler, Sreedevi Yedavalli

bcc

Subject Re: draft permit - American Energy

[REDACTED]

-----Janet Pellegrini/R5/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

From: Janet Pellegrini/R5/USEPA/US

Date: 11/29/2012 05:03PM

Cc: Patrick Kuefler/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Sreedevi Yedavalli/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject: Re: draft permit - American Energy

Pete,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

thanks again,
Janet

Peter Jackson---11/26/2012 03:29:56 PM---Janet, here are my comments on the American Energy permit based on the forwarded email from Eric Nyg

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US

To: Janet Pellegrini/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,

Cc: Patrick Kuefler/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Sreedevi Yedavalli/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 11/26/2012 03:29 PM

Subject: Re: draft permit - American Energy

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thanks, Pete

Sreedevi Yedavalli---11/19/2012 02:04:32 PM---Pete, Thank you for reviewing the permit. Yes, Janet is the permit reviewer and comment period ends

From: Sreedevi Yedavalli/R5/USEPA/US
To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: Patrick Kuefler/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Janet Pellegrini/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 11/19/2012 02:04 PM
Subject: Re: draft permit - American Energy

Pete,

[REDACTED]

Thank you,
Sreedevi

Peter Jackson---11/19/2012 12:55:18 PM---Sreedevi, Did you say Janet is the lead reviewer of the American Energy permit you sent me? Also, j

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US
To: Sreedevi Yedavalli/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 11/19/2012 12:55 PM
Subject: Re: draft permit - American Energy

Sreedevi,

[REDACTED]

Thanks, Pete

Sreedevi Yedavalli---11/14/2012 02:58:50 PM---Pete, Attached is the draft of the American Energy permit.

From: Sreedevi Yedavalli/R5/USEPA/US
To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 11/14/2012 02:58 PM
Subject: draft permit - American Energy

Pete,
Attached is the draft of the American Energy permit.
Thank you,
Sreedevi

[attachment "0IL00159.pdf" deleted by Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US]

2016-005625-R5--87

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

12/11/2012 09:04 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Fw: Scioto BE - Coming at You Once Again!

Pete



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE December 2012.doc

Candice Bauer

can i get newer version? ***** ...

12/11/2012 08:55:05 AM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 12/11/2012 08:55 AM
Subject: Fw: Scioto BE - Coming at You Once Again!

can i get newer version?

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

----- Forwarded by Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US on 12/11/2012 08:54 AM -----

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 10/01/2012 08:35 AM
Subject: Scioto BE - Coming at You Once Again!

Candice, attached are two drafts, one with my comments in reply to your comments (has "crb" in title - this will generally answer questions and indicate how I responded in the BE etc.), and one (title includes "October") with the actual changes made. I kept your edited document separate as I had made further changes since sending you this version and did not want to risk losing some of those changes.

Unless I get antsy I will probably wait for you to review the changes and let me know what you think. Hopefully, it is still somewhat fresh and you can focus on the changes based on your previous comments. Also, you did not get through the whole thing, so the rest awaits you!

Wouldn't it be something if we finished?!

Pete

[attachment "Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE October 2012.doc" deleted by Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US] [attachment "Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE crb91212.doc" deleted by

Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US]

2016-005625-R5--88

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Peter Jackson

cc

12/11/2012 11:02 AM

bcc

Subject edits



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE December 2012crb.doc

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.

Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)

77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604

Office Phone: 312-353-2106

Fax: 312-697-2668

Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

2016-005625-R5--89

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

12/12/2012 04:14 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject BE Revisited

Candice, take a look at the sections you modified, and my suggested mods to your mods. Also, before you take a look, a few things I uncovered with some digging:

1) does OH have a 5 degree delta T provision in its narrative WQS? Nope; the only R5 state without one, aside from WI.

2) Aquatic Life des uses in the Big Darby Creek w'shed:

- Little Darby: EWH the full length, plus CWH from RM 36 to headwaters
- Big Darby: EWH the full length, plus CWH from RM 79 to headwaters

3) How do trib temps compare with mainstem temps?

I began by reviewing the whole Big Darby WQ report. This watershed is unique in the strong influence of groundwater in keeping temps low. Also, shading is a major factor in determining stream temperature. So even more than position in the watershed, the extent of these two factors in any given locale largely controls temperature, i.e. regardless of stream size per se. But since these two factors tend to be more influential in smaller streams, temperatures tend to be lower in smaller tribs than in mainstems.

A couple of examples: Spain Creek (CWH):

- upstream 16.5 C
- RM 3.4: 18.3 C
- RM 0.1: 20.0 C

Little Darby:

- RM 41.2: 13.9 C
- RM 39.3: 17.8 C

Big Walnut Creek WQ report: temp gradually increases as you go downstream (rises from ~18 C to ~23 C). This is stated as being a likely result of shading and a lower %age of groundwater as a % of total stream flow.

Last note, I perused 4 or 5 water quality reports for the upper Scioto Basin and found very few temps over 25 C in any of them, even in other areas than Big Darby.

Pete



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE December 2012crb.doc

2016-005625-R5--90

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

12/17/2012 09:32 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Scioto BE

Candice, I did a little tweaking, can you scroll down and look at my comments and changes where you commented? Any chance we can still have a meeting with the bosses?

Pete



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE December 2012crb.doc

2016-005625-R5--91

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

12/18/2012 03:39 PM

To Nicole Cantello

cc Candice Bauer, Linda Holst, David Pfeifer

bcc

Subject Scioto BE Ready to Go

Nicole,

We have been slowly but steadily re-working the Scioto BE. A summary document is attached. Our goal is to send out tomorrow (Wednesday) if you are OK with us sending, but if after reviewing the summary document you would like to discuss and/or review the revised BE please let me know and we can hold off until after the holidays.

It again came down to the mussels, and of 42 segments we had 5 no effect segments and 37 not likely segments. I need to make a few final revisions to the BE and it will be done tomorrow morning. Let me know if you would like to see it (kind of like bumping into an old friend!?).

Thanks, Pete



Summary of Scioto BE Dec 18 2012.docx

2016-005625-R5--92

Nicole Cantello /R5/USEPA/US

To Peter Jackson

12/18/2012 04:06 PM

cc Candice Bauer, David Pfeifer, Linda Holst

bcc

Subject Re: Scioto BE Ready to Go

I will review and try to get you anything by tomorrow .

Best,

Nicole Cantello
Attorney-Advisor
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 5 (C-14J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60604
312/886-2870
312/692-2146 fax
cantello.nicole@epa.gov

Peter Jackson

Nicole, We have been slowly but steady...

12/18/2012 03:39:29 PM

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US
To: Nicole Cantello/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Linda Holst/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, David
Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 12/18/2012 03:39 PM
Subject: Scioto BE Ready to Go

Nicole,

We have been slowly but steadily re-working the Scioto BE. A summary document is attached. Our goal is to send out tomorrow (Wednesday) if you are OK with us sending, but if after reviewing the summary document you would like to discuss and/or review the revised BE please let me know and we can hold off until after the holidays.

It again came down to the mussels, and of 42 segments we had 5 no effect segments and 37 not likely segments. I need to make a few final revisions to the BE and it will be done tomorrow morning. Let me know if you would like to see it (kind of like bumping into an old friend!?).

Thanks, Pete



Summary of Scioto BE Dec 18 2012.docx

2016-005625-R5--93

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

12/19/2012 08:43 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Scioto BE Letter

Candice, I am going over the BE to make changes consistent with the revisions in our conclusions , need to make sure thos are consistently stated throughout. In the meantime, here is the letter, can you give a quick look before I send it to Anita?

Thx, Pete



FWS Scioto DO Temp pH Cyanide BE Letter.doc

2016-005625-R5--94

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To Peter Jackson, Anita Chico

12/19/2012 09:07 AM

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Scioto BE Letter

Anita- Pete is working on finalizing a BE today to be sent to FWS. While I am going to take one last look at the BE before sending it along to you for sign-off, the transmittal letter is ready for your review and printing. We hope to have a final version of the BE to you before the end of the week. Are you in all week?



FWS Scioto DO Temp pH Cyanide BE Lettercrb.doc

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Peter Jackson

Candice, I am going over the BE to ma...

12/19/2012 08:43:08 AM

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 12/19/2012 08:43 AM
Subject: Scioto BE Letter

Candice, I am going over the BE to make changes consistent with the revisions in our conclusions, need to make sure those are consistently stated throughout. In the meantime, here is the letter, can you give a quick look before I send it to Anita?

Thx, Pete

[attachment "FWS Scioto DO Temp pH Cyanide BE Letter.doc" deleted by Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US]

2016-005625-R5--95

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

12/19/2012 09:48 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc Anita Chico

bcc

Subject Re: Scioto BE Letter

Anita, I am out after today so assuming we do not get the BE completed and reviewed by Candice today, Candice can shepherd this through with you by the end of this week IF Candice has time and IF you are in. It would be cool to get it out before year's end.

Thanks and Happy Christmas!

Pete

Candice Bauer

Anita- Pete is working on finalizing a B...

12/19/2012 09:07:39 AM

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US

To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Anita Chico/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,

Date: 12/19/2012 09:07 AM

Subject: Re: Scioto BE Letter

Anita- Pete is working on finalizing a BE today to be sent to FWS. While I am going to take one last look at the BE before sending it along to you for sign-off, the transmittal letter is ready for your review and printing. We hope to have a final version of the BE to you before the end of the week. Are you in all week?

[attachment "FWS Scioto DO Temp pH Cyanide BE Lettercrb.doc" deleted by Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US]

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.

Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)

77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604

Office Phone: 312-353-2106

Fax: 312-697-2668

Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

Peter Jackson

Candice, I am going over the BE to ma...

12/19/2012 08:43:08 AM

2016-005625-R5--96

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

12/19/2012 09:52 AM

To Candice Bauer, Nicole Cantello

cc

bcc

Subject Forgot to Attache the Actual BE



Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE Final December 2012.doc

2016-005625-R5--97

Nicole Cantello /R5/USEPA/US

To Peter Jackson

cc Candice Bauer

12/19/2012 12:22 PM

bcc

Subject Re: Forgot to Attache the Actual BE

This was long! Reading through it took up my entire morning. I've attached my (minor) comments

Best,

Nicole Cantello
Attorney-Advisor
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 5 (C-14J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60604
312/886-2870
312/692-2146 fax
cantello.nicole@epa.gov

-----Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA, Nicole Cantello/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US

Date: 12/19/2012 09:52AM

Subject: Forgot to Attache the Actual BE

(See attached file: Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE Final December 2012.doc)

[attachment "Scioto Basin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH BE Final December 2012.doc" removed by Nicole



Cantello/R5/USEPA/US]2012.12.19SciotoBasin NC comments.doc

2016-005625-R5--98

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

12/19/2012 04:04 PM

To Candice Bauer

cc

bcc

Subject Here "Tis - Scioto BE, One Mo Time!



SciotoBasin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH Cy BE Final Final.doc

2016-005625-R5--99

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

12/21/2012 12:12 PM

To Anita Chico

cc Linda Holst, Peter Jackson

bcc

Subject Enclosure for OH Scioto BE transmittal memo

I have reviewed the attached file. It is ready to be printed and sent to FWS, per the transmittal memo that Pete prepared and which Dave and I signed off on earlier this week.

Please contact me if you have any questions.



SciotoBasin 3745-1-09 DO Temp pH Cy BE 122112.doc

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

2016-005625-R5--100

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

01/03/2013 11:45 AM

To Candice Bauer

cc David Pfeifer, Linda Holst

bcc

Subject Status of Ohio Designated Use BEs

Candice,

Per your suggestion, here is a summary of the Ohio designated use BEs that are outstanding. This might aid in our discussions with Dave. Note that some of the boxes over on the right need to be expanded to read the contents.....

Pete



Ohio Designated Use BE Status January 2013.xlsx

2016-005625-R5--101

Candice Bauer /R5/USEPA/US

To David Pfeifer

01/15/2013 04:09 PM

cc Thomas Poleck

bcc

Subject Fw: Quick updates to AL criteria assistance requests

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

----- Forwarded by Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US on 01/15/2013 03:57 PM -----

From: Danielle Anderson/DC/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 01/15/2013 03:53 PM
Subject: Quick updates to AL criteria assistance requests

Hi Candice,

When you have a moment, could you please take a look at the items below and edit the info to reflect the most current status? (I wasn't quite sure on all items and included a few edits in [blue](#)). Thanks!

Registration	Status	AL, HH, N	Date (YYYY-MM-DD)	Issue	Status/Deadline	SHPD Lead	HECD Lead
--------------	--------	-----------	-------------------	-------	-----------------	-----------	-----------

[illegible]

			changes have little effect on endangered species, the consultation would need to address prior approval and FWS's nonconcurrence.			
5	multiple	AL/ESA	Possible need for data reviews to support R5's ongoing efforts to provide technical information to R5 states and complete necessary regional ESA consultations for dissolved oxygen, pH, cyanide, cadmium, chloride, and sulfate.	Review of data (up through 11/2012) for cadmium RE Oregon WQS/ESA consultation is ongoing. This information could be used for R5 consultation regarding cadmium.	Danielle Anderson	Wade Lehmann
5	OH	AL/ESA	Ammonia criteria ESA consultation	Pending release of ammonia criteria, Region 5 will reinitiate consultation with Ohio (and potentially WI and IL) FWS to resolve prior approvals pending completion of consultation.	Danielle Anderson	

Thanks!
Danielle

Danielle Salvaterra Anderson
U.S. EPA, Office of Water
Office of Science & Technology
Standards & Health Protection Division
Regional, State, & Tribal Standards Support Branch
MC 4305T

T: 202-564-1631
F: 202-566-9981

2016-005625-R5--102

David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US

01/24/2013 11:44 AM

To Danielle Anderson

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Quick updates to AL criteria assistance requests

I buried this, sorry.

David Pfeifer
Water Quality Standards
USEPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-9024

fax: 312-582-5164

e-mail: pfeifer.david@epa.gov

----- Forwarded by David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US on 01/24/2013 11:44 AM -----

From: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US
To: David Pfeifer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: Thomas Poleck/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 01/15/2013 04:09 PM
Subject: Fw: Quick updates to AL criteria assistance requests

I've updated my stuff (purple text), but am leaving MN stuff alone because I can't keep track of what they are doing! Feel free to edit and then return to Danielle, per her request.

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Region 5 Water Quality Branch (WQ-16J)
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106
Fax: 312-697-2668
Hours: Monday - Friday 9am to 3:30pm

----- Forwarded by Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US on 01/15/2013 03:57 PM -----

From: Danielle Anderson/DC/USEPA/US
To: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 01/15/2013 03:53 PM
Subject: Quick updates to AL criteria assistance requests

Hi Candice,

When you have a moment, could you please take a look at the items below and edit the info to reflect the most current status? (I wasn't quite sure on all items and included a few edits in [blue](#)). Thanks!

Region	State	AL, HH, N	Date (YYY Y-M M-D D)	Issue	Status/Deadline	SHPD Lead	HECD Lead
--------	-------	-----------	----------------------	-------	-----------------	-----------	-----------

[illegible]

5	IN	AL/ESA	Chronic chloride ESA consultation- Planning to 7(d) the action; targeted to produce Biological evaluation as soon as possible after approval	Reviewing latest chloride data for incorporation into biological evaluation, which could lead to formal consultation.	Danielle Anderson	Luis Cruz
5	IN	AL/ESA	Acute sulfate ESA consultation- Although current pending action's changes have little effect on endangered species, the consultation would need to address prior approval and FWS's nonconcurrence.	Completion of consultation targeted for end of FY13, pending successful resolution of chloride consultation	Danielle Anderson	
5	multiple	AL/ESA	Possible need for data reviews to support R5's ongoing efforts to provide technical information to R5 states and complete necessary regional ESA consultations for dissolved oxygen, pH, cyanide, cadmium, chloride, and sulfate.	Review of data (up through 11/2012) for cadmium RE Oregon WQS/ESA consultation is ongoing. This information could be used for R5 consultation regarding cadmium.	Danielle Anderson	Wade Lehmann
5	OH	AL/ESA	Ammonia criteria ESA consultation	Pending release of ammonia criteria, Region 5 will reinitiate consultation with Ohio (and potentially WI and IL) FWS to resolve prior approvals pending completion of consultation.	Danielle Anderson	

Thanks!
Danielle

Danielle Salvaterra Anderson
U.S. EPA, Office of Water
Office of Science & Technology
Standards & Health Protection Division
Regional, State, & Tribal Standards Support Branch

MC 4305T

T: 202-564-1631

F: 202-566-9981

2016-005625-R5--103

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

01/31/2013 08:16 AM

To Jeromy_Applegate

cc

bcc

Subject Scioto DO Temp pH Cyanide BE

Hello Jeromy,

Long time! How are you? I am emailing to see if you received and have had a chance to take a look at the latest Scioto BE we sent your office around a month ago? How do things look as far as discussing that document at some point? Looking forward to hearing your thoughts.

Thanks,

Pete Jackson
EPA Region 5
312-886-3894

2016-005625-R5--104

"Applegate, Jeromy"
<jeromy_applegate@fws.gov>

To Peter Jackson

cc

bcc

01/31/2013 12:25 PM

Subject Re: Scioto DO Temp pH Cyanide BE

Hi Pete,

Good to hear from you. Yes, I did receive it, but haven't had a chance to look at it. Could I get back with you next week about a good time to discuss the document?

Jeromy Applegate
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U S Fish and Wildlife Service
Ohio Ecological Services Field Office
4625 Morse Rd., Suite 104
Columbus, OH 43230
Phone: 614-416-8993 ext. 21
FAX: 614-416-8994

On Thu, Jan 31, 2013 at 9:16 AM, <Jackson.Peter@epamail.epa.gov> wrote:

Hello Jeromy,

Long time! How are you? I am emailing to see if you received and have had a chance to take a look at the latest Scioto BE we sent your office around a month ago ? How do things look as far as discussing that document at some point ? Looking forward to hearing your thoughts.

Thanks,

Pete Jackson
EPA Region 5
312-886-3894

2016-005625-R5--105

Peter Jackson /R5/USEPA/US

01/31/2013 01:00 PM

To "Applegate, Jeromy"

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Scioto DO Temp pH Cyanide BE

That would be fine Jeromy, thanks.

Pere

"Applegate, Jeromy"

Hi Pete, Good to hear from you. ...

01/31/2013 12:25:13 PM

From: "Applegate, Jeromy" <jeromy_applegate@fws.gov>
To: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US@EPA,
Date: 01/31/2013 12:25 PM
Subject: Re: Scioto DO Temp pH Cyanide BE

Hi Pete,

Good to hear from you. Yes, I did receive it, but haven't had a chance to look at it. Could I get back with you next week about a good time to discuss the document?

Jeromy Applegate

Fish and Wildlife Biologist

U S Fish and Wildlife Service

Ohio Ecological Services Field Office

4625 Morse Rd., Suite 104

Columbus, OH 43230

Phone: 614-416-8993 ext. 21

FAX: 614-416-8994

On Thu, Jan 31, 2013 at 9:16 AM, <Jackson.Peter@epamail.epa.gov> wrote:

Hello Jeromy,

Long time! How are you? I am emailing to see if you received and have had a chance to take a look at the latest Scioto BE we sent your office around a month ago ? How do things look as far as discussing that document at some point ? Looking forward to hearing your thoughts.

Thanks,

Pete Jackson
EPA Region 5
312-886-3894

2016-005625-R5--106

Linda Holst

06/23/2016 03:04 PM

To

cc

bcc

Subject UPGLOAD

C:\Users\Lholst\Documents_MovedData\EPAWork\LINDA\F
OIA\2016 FOIA cyanide_non email files\ESA
Monthly_agenda_4-10.doc



- ESA Monthly_agenda_4-10.doc

2016-005625-R5--107

Linda Holst

06/23/2016 03:05 PM

To

cc

bcc

Subject UPLOAD
C:\Users\Lholst\Documents_MovedData\EPAWork\LINDA\F
OIA\2016 FOIA cyanide_non email files\ESA WQSMA
October 2010 10-12-10.pptx



- ESA WQSMA October 2010 10-12-10.pptx

2016-005625-R5--108

Linda Holst

06/23/2016 03:05 PM

To

cc

bcc

Subject UPLOAD
C:\Users\Lholst\Documents_MovedData\EPAWork\LINDA\F
OIA\2016 FOIA cyanide_non email files\ESA WQSMA
October 2010.pptx



- ESA WQSMA October 2010.pptx

2016-005625-R5--109

Linda Holst

06/23/2016 03:05 PM

To

cc

bcc

Subject UPLOAD
C:\Users\Lholst\Documents_MovedData\EPAWork\LINDA\F
OIA\2016 FOIA cyanide_non email files\OhioBE12110.doc



- OhioBE12110.doc

2016-005625-R5--110

Linda Holst

06/23/2016 03:05 PM

To

cc

bcc

Subject UPLOAD

C:\Users\Lholst\Documents_MovedData\EPAWork\LINDA\F
OIA\2016 FOIA cyanide_non email files\Talking Points for
FWS and Ohio EPA Call on Designation Use Changes
020410.doc



- Talking Points for FWS and Ohio EPA Call on Designation Use Changes 020410.doc

2016-005625-R5--111

David Pfeifer /R5/USEPA/US

06/29/2016 03:35 PM

To Peter Jackson

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Revised Ohio BE for You to Work On

Meeting

Date 01/26/2011 12:01:00 PM

Time 12:01:00 PM to

Chair David Pfeifer

Invitees

Required

Optional

FYI

Location

Just so you can see what Eric is up to on ESA...forgot to copy you.

Pete

----- Forwarded by Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US on 01/26/2011 08:25 AM -----

From: Peter Jackson/R5/USEPA/US
To: Eric Stadig/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Candice Bauer/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 01/26/2011 08:24 AM
Subject: Revised Ohio BE for You to Work On

Eric, the species account for pink mucket looks great! I did add in a few questions, you can review and respond as appropriate. Then add in the accounts for the three proposed endangered mussels in Appendix F (snuffbox, rayed bean, and sheepsnose). In addition to the detailed info in the Federal Registers, you might be able to find more info on these three species by going to the FWS endangered species website, also by googling. I will send you any species accounts I have worked up for Wisconsin for snuffbox and sheepsnose.

Once those are in place, and once Milo makes the revised maps for the three PE species, we can get you going on the analysis for these three species.

Nice work, thanks!

Pete



OHIOBEFWsCommentsES1242011.docx